

The Relationship of Repression-Sensitization
to Aspects of Marital Dyad Functioning

By

DENNIS ALVIN DAY

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
1972



To my wife,
Priscilla

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to gratefully acknowledge the assistance he received from the members of his supervisory committee: Drs. Benjamin Barger, Chairman; Carl Clarke, Marvin Shaw, and Richard McGee of the Department of Psychology; and Dr. Gerald Leslie of the Department of Sociology. He also wishes to thank Mr. Larry Carstensen for assisting with the statistical analysis and the computer programming.

He wishes to express a special word of appreciation to Dr. Carl Clarke, who provided invaluable professional competence and personal encouragement in all phases of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Background	1
Self-Perception	7
Personal Adjustment	11
Group Process	14
Implications for Present Research	21
Study of R-S in the Marital Relationship	23
II METHOD	28
Subjects	28
Instruments	29
Procedure	33
Analysis	34
Hypotheses	35
III RESULTS	41
IV DISCUSSION	52
APPENDICES	70
APPENDIX A. Health and Opinion Survey	71
APPENDIX B. Locke-Wallace	81
APPENDIX C. Marriage and College Environment Inventory	83
APPENDIX D. Bales' Rating Scales	92

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX E. Inventory of Marital Conflict . .	94
APPENDIX F. Additional Statistical Tables . .	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY	112
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	115

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Analysis of Variance of Locke-Wallace Ratings for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers . . .	42
2	Ranked Means of Locke-Wallace Ratings for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	42
3	Ranked Means of Locke-Wallace Ratings for All Neutral Dyads	43
4	Analysis of Variance of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	44
5	Ranked Means of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	44
6	Ranked Means of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for Neutrals in NR, NN, and NS Dyads . . .	45
7	Ranked Means of IMC "Win index" for Both Mates in RS Dyad	46
8	Ranked Means of Bales' "Difference Score" for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	47
9	Analysis of Variance of Bales' "Difference Score" Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	48
10	Analysis of Variance of Bales' (4-8) Self-Ratings for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers . . .	49
11	Ranked Means of Bales' (4-8) for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	49
12	Analysis of Variance of Bales' (4-8) Rating-of-Spouse Score for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	49
13	Ranked Means of Bales' (4-8) Rating-of-Spouse Score for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	50

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
14	Analysis of Variance of MACE "Agreement Score" for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	50
15	Ranked Means of MACE "Agreement Score" for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers	51

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate
Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELATIONSHIP OF REPRESSION-SENSITIZATION
TO ASPECTS OF MARITAL DYAD FUNCTIONING

By

Dennis Alvin Day

June, 1972

Chairman: Dr. Benjamin Barger
Co-Chairman: Dr. Carl T. Clarke
Major Department: Department of Psychology

The present investigation represents an attempt to examine and extend findings from previous studies of the repression-sensitization, R-S, personality construct into the context of the marital dyad. In the R-S dimension, repression has been represented as an orientation of avoidance of threatening stimuli, while sensitization has been represented as an orientation of approach to threatening stimuli. Relevant literature was reviewed with focus being made upon those studies which related R-S to aspects of small group interaction. It was pointed out after this review that research efforts were needed to relate the R-S variable to the process and outcome features of natural groups. Also, it was presented that information about the neutral on the R-S dimension could serve to answer important issues in R-S theory. Finally, the need to compare self-rating data with data collected by other means was emphasized. The marital dyad was chosen as the crucible for examining issues from R-S research because of several reasons: (1) the marital

dyad is a substantive area in need of research from many perspectives, (2) it is naturally-found, (3) it is self-selected, and (4) it is of a long-term nature. The specific areas of marital dyad functioning that were assessed by research measurements were as follows: (1) marital adjustment, (2) the perception of satisfaction and stress of marriage in a college setting, (3) the resolution of marital conflicts, (4) the perception of own aggressiveness, (5) the perception of spouse's aggressiveness, and (6) the congruency between self-perception and perception by one's mate.

The participants in this investigation were randomly chosen and individually contacted married college couples. Couples were successively contacted until 60 dyads, representing all combinations of repressor, neutral, and sensitizer mates, were identified and were willing to participate in the study. Data relevant to this research's interests were collected during both the initial identification session of the study and a second measurement session.

The main findings of this study, as related to each of the separate hypotheses, are as follows:

(1) Repressors reported significantly better marital adjustment than did the sensitizers and neutrals.

(2) For all three R-S categories, repressors, neutrals, and sensitizers, the lower their spouse's R-S score, the better was their marital adjustment.

(3) Sensitizers reported significantly greater stress from their life situation, relative to their reporting of satisfaction, than did repressors and neutrals.

(4) For all R-S categories, repressors, neutrals, and sensitizers, the lower their spouse's R-S score, the lower was their assessment of stress from their life situation.

(5) The sensitizer, when married to the repressor, prevailed in having his judgment endorsed by his repressor mate, when both were confronted with ambiguous choice situations.

(6) The sensitizer perceived himself to be more aggressive in social situations than his mate perceived him to be. There was no such discrepancy in the case of the repressor.

(7) The sensitizer rated himself as behaving at a significantly more aggressive level than the repressor rated himself to be.

(8) The feelings that the repressor held about aspects of his life situation were more congruently perceived by his mate than was the case for the sensitizer.

It was argued that these findings support the following inferences: (1) that R-S is linearly related to measures of personal and marital adjustment, (2) that R-S denotes a construct that is more general and comprehensive than previously considered, (3) that R-S represents more than just a "response bias," and (4) that the expression and reaction to "aggressiveness" seems an important differentiating behavior relative to R-S.

It was posited that R-S differentiates a generalized style of reactivity to both personal and interpersonal events, which in turn relates to experiencing both the impact and evaluation of these events in characteristic terms of stress-satisfaction and negativity-positivity. Finally, possible implications of this research for marital counseling were discussed.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The personality construct Repression-Sensitization (R-S) has stimulated several research efforts to assess its value and to determine its relationship to individual functioning in situations of threat, ambiguity, and conflict. More recently, additional interesting findings have been reported relating R-S to various aspects of group functioning. The present research investigation represents an attempt to examine and extend findings from previous studies of the R-S construct into the context of the marital dyad.¹

Theoretical Background

Before presenting an explanation and rationale for the present study, the historical development and scope of this research area will be outlined.

¹A point of clarification should be offered about the relationship of R-S to the instrument used to assess R-S (Health and Opinion Survey). On this self-rating instrument (Derived from MMPI scales), an individual who achieves a low HOS score falls at the repressing end of the R-S continuum, while an individual who achieves a high HOS score falls at the sensitizing end. Thus, a direct linear relationship between R-S and a dependent variable would indicate that the sensitizer ranks high on that particular factor, while an inverse linear relationship would indicate that the repressor ranks high on that factor.

The R-S construct evolved from studies in the late 1940's and the 1950's that have since been referred to as the "new look" in perception. The essential feature of this "new look" orientation was its approach to perception as being an active process, wherein features of the perceiver figured perhaps as importantly in the process of perception as features of the perceived stimuli. This orientation to perception as an active process was described by Bruner and Postman (1947),

Perception is a form of adaptive behavior. Its operation reflects not only the characteristics of sensorineural processes, but also the dominant needs, attitudes, and values of the organism.
(p. 69)

John C. Raven (1951) also describes this orientation as follows,

Our perception of events is intentional in the sense that we always respond to and perceive events with intent, as if reaching out with desire or effort directed toward the apprehension of some objective, although at the time not necessarily realized and not necessarily pursued with deliberation. (p. 15)

A newly identified phenomenon was reported in this early research - one which stimulated many diverse studies. The experimental situation for these studies involved the measure of recognition thresholds for tachistoscopically presented words of different affective value. It was found that two distinct patterns of differential recognition thresholds existed for some subjects when visually perceiving these "neutral" and "threatening" stimuli. One of these response patterns was identified by subjects who exhibited a significantly higher threshold for the recognition of "threatening"

stimuli than for "neutral stimuli." This response style was characterized as an avoidance of threat or fear and was termed "perceptual defense." While this finding is congruent with long-established concepts about the avoiding of unwelcome or fear-provoking stimuli, a perceptual pattern was discovered that was not of such a predictable nature. This latter response pattern was identified by subjects who revealed a significantly lower threshold for the recognition of threatening stimuli than for neutral stimuli. This response style was characterized as an "approach" to threat or fear and it was termed "perceptual vigilance."

Since the most important of the early investigations of these perceptual findings were done by Jerome Bruner and Leo Postman, a review of their experimental method and procedure will be presented. In this study (Bruner and Postman, 1947) subject's associative reaction times were elicited to a variety of stimuli words. These stimuli included words of both neutral and potentially "threatening" connotation. Examples of the latter, threatening words, include rape, penis, and death. From the associative reaction time data, an individualized list of three groups of words was arranged for each subject. These three groups consisted of those words that had the longest associative reaction times, the shortest associative reaction times, and the midmost reaction times. At a later experimental session each subject was asked to recognize this latter selection of words as they again were presented tachistoscopically. The exposure time for each

stimulus word was progressively increased until the word was correctly recognized. Two different recognition patterns were found to exist for some of these subjects. One of the patterns was defined by a longer exposure time for the recognition of the threatening words as compared to the exposure time necessary for the recognition of the neutral words. While the other pattern involved exactly the opposite relationship, i.e. a relatively shorter exposure time was necessary for the threatening words compared to the neutral words. The first of these patterns, or perceptual styles, exemplifies perceptual defense and the second exemplifies perceptual vigilance.

The term perceptual defense has subsequently evolved into the term "repression," and the term perceptual vigilance has evolved into the term "sensitization." Since the sensitizer, perceptual vigilant, recognizes the threatening stimuli earlier than the neutral stimuli, this perceptual style was also characterized as one of "approach," while the style of the repressor, perceptual defender, which revealed the opposite relationship was characterized as one of "avoidance." Both of these perceptual modes share the fact that they involve differential awareness to threatening stimuli. Consequently, both have been thought to represent polar opposites in the handling of the anxiety or fear that is aroused by aversive stimuli. Hence, the perceptual styles have also been thought of as defense mechanisms, while their polarity

has been considered to anchor an approach-avoidance dimension of individual reactivity to aversive stimuli.

The majority of research subsequent to the investigation by Bruner and Postman can be divided into two successive conceptual endeavors. The earlier efforts consisted of diverse attempts to verify, explain, and extend the nature of these identified perceptual phenomena, while the second group of investigations proceeded from the established fact of individual differences in perceptual style, in an effort to determine how this relates to self-perception, person perception, personal adjustment, and interpersonal interaction. It is with this latter group of investigations that the present research derives its conceptual ground.

A crucial feature of this second development in R-S research was the establishment of a psychometric assessment instrument of the Repression-Sensitization dimension. This psychometric identification of perceptual style contrasts with the original determination of R-S accomplished by psychophysiological methods. One of the first attempts to utilize selected Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales as a measure of R-S was made by Jesse Gordon (1957). He also originally coined the term sensitization. His effort was followed by several attempts to utilize single scales of the MMPI to assess R-S. The next development was by Altrocchi, Parsons, and Dickoff (1960) who utilized multiple MMPI scales to assess R-S style. However, it was Byrne (1961) who

accomplished certain advances in the usage of multiple MMPI scales that established a measure that was accepted by others in this research area. His instrument, the Health and Opinion Survey (HOS) (1963), has been shown to have split-half reliability of .94 and test-retest reliability of .83 (three months).

The R-S construct has thus become the generally accepted term for the dimension of perceptual defense-perceptual vigilance: Repression being the counterpart of perceptual defense and sensitization being the counterpart of perceptual vigilance. Repression represents a generalized mode of avoidance to potentially threatening stimuli and sensitization represents a generalized mode of approach to potentially threatening stimuli. Inferences have been made in regards to the characteristic defense mechanisms subserved by both extremes of the R-S dimension. It is hypothesized that the repressor utilizes defense behaviors such as denial and avoidance, while the sensitizer utilizes the defensive behaviors of manifest worrying, obsession-compulsion, and intellectualization.

Since the present investigation is concerned with the relationship of R-S to features of interpersonal functioning in the marital dyad, selected research in the areas of self-perception, person perception, and personal adjustment in group interaction as related to R-S will be reviewed.

Self-Perception

Altrocchi et al. (1960) reported that R-S was positively correlated with self-ratings for being rebellious, aggressive, and self-effacing. This pattern of self-description resulted in a general portrait of the sensitizer as one who manifested a poorer self-image than was true for the repressor. In fact, the related finding that the sensitizer had a greater discrepancy between his self-image and his ideal-image than did the repressor, was also accounted for by the sensitizer's lower self-image. That is, both the sensitizer and the repressor had a similar ideal-image, but the sensitizer's lower self-image resulted in a greater self-ideal discrepancy.

In an investigation by Byrne, Barry, and Nelson (1963), the previous finding of there being a greater self-ideal discrepancy for sensitizers than repressors was again examined. This time, however, the newly revised R-S scale developed by Byrne (the Health and Opinion Survey, HOS) was utilized to identify repressors and sensitizers. The previous findings were replicated, in that the sensitizer revealed a greater self-ideal discrepancy than the repressor. Also, as before this discrepancy was shown to be a function of the sensitizer's lower self-image. A second aspect of this study involved testing the hypothesis that R-S would be related to differences in the ways repressors and sensitizers handle hostility. To assess this hypothesis, the Hostility Incongruency Test (Byrne, 1961) was correlated with R-S. The

former measure represents a further development of an instrument devised by McReynolds (1958). This instrument assesses the extent to which one's feelings and values are inconsistent for specific areas of behavior. The procedure for this latter assessment consisted of having the subject evaluate various statements, all involving some degree of hostility, along three identified dimensions: Like-Dislike, Good-Bad, and Pleasant-Unpleasant. Incongruency was defined and measured by totaling items that were placed at conflicting poles across the three dimensions. For instance, with the Like-Dislike and Good-Bad dimensions, a score of incongruency was counted whenever a person rated a particular behavior as occupying both the Like and Bad poles simultaneously, or whenever a behavior was rated at both the Dislike and Good poles simultaneously. It was found that incongruency was correlated significantly and positively with R-S across all of the incongruency measures. And, more importantly, it was found that only one of the two possible subvarieties of incongruency accounted for this correlation. This is, the Like-Bad, Like-Unpleasant, and Bad-Pleasant sub scores were significantly correlated with R-S, while the Dislike-Good, Dislike-Pleasant, and Bad-Pleasant scores were shown to be uncorrelated with R-S. Thus, it was found by this investigation that sensitizers tend to report conflicted feelings and attitudes related to their liking and enjoying hostile behavior that they also consider to be bad or morally wrong, while this was not the case for repressors.

Altrocchi, Shrauger, and McLeod (1964) employed two separate measures of hostility, the Rosenweig Picture Frustration Test and a self-rating scale, to further examine the relationship of R-S and hostility. They obtained results that were consistent with those of the previous investigations. That is, sensitizers revealed more hostility than did repressors on both of these measures.

Byrne and Sheffield (1965) explored the hypothesis that sensitizers would react with greater verbalized anxiety than would repressors in a situation involving sexually arousing stimuli. A factorial design was utilized wherein different groups of repressors and sensitizers read either sexually explicit passages or sexually neutral passages that were taken from the same book. Self-ratings of arousal were then obtained and significant differences were found to exist between the experimental groups. Significantly greater arousal was found for both the repressor and sensitizer groups who read the sexually explicit passages. More interesting, however, was the difference between repressors and sensitizers that emerged when a correlation was made between the scale for sexual arousal and the remaining rating scales. It was found that distinctly different patterns of feelings associated with sexual arousal emerged for the sensitizers and the repressors. Whereas the sensitizers reported feelings of (1) being entertained, (2) lack of boredom, and (3) being anxious -- the repressors revealed feelings of (1) being

disgusted, and (2) being angry. These differences between sensitizers and repressors in their self-rated feelings associated with sexual arousal are open to several possible interpretations. One interpretation that would appear to fit especially well would involve the idea that the repressor feels less anxiety in potentially threatening situations due to directing his feelings outward, while the sensitizer feels more anxiety due to directing of his feelings inward.

A study by Altrocchi (1961) provides information of how the repressor's and the sensitizer's evaluation of their own characteristics compares to their evaluation of others. The subjects in this study rated themselves and three classmates on the Leary Interpersonal Check List. An analysis was made of the difference between the subject's self-perception and his perception of others. This analysis was expressed in terms of a measure of the assumed dissimilarity between self and others. It was found by this index that the sensitizer assumes a significantly greater disparity between himself and others than is true for the repressor.

The several previously described investigations reveal consistent findings that the sensitizer evaluates both himself and others differently than does the repressor. It was also established that the general direction of this difference was in terms of the sensitizer manifesting a less positive evaluation of himself than he has for others. Other investigations will now be cited which attempt to ascertain whether

R-S might also be related to differences in the area of personal adjustment.

Personal Adjustment

Byrne, Golightly, and Sheffield (1965) tested the hypothesis that R-S would be related to personal adjustment in a curvilinear fashion. This hypothesis was based on the argument that "Neither obsessional concern with conflicts nor selective forgetting of them should result in optimal adjustment" (p. 586). Here, the "obsessional concern" with conflicts would characterize the sensitizers, and the "selective forgetting" of conflicts would characterize the repressor. The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was administered as the measure of adjustment, and each of the eighteen CPI scales was correlated with R-S. It was shown that significant correlations existed between R-S and seven of the CPI scales. The direction of this correlation, without exception, indicated that sensitizers were more maladjusted than were repressors. The scores of persons falling in the "Neutral" range of the R-S scale were also examined in this study. They were found to fall between those of the repressors and the sensitizers. Thus, a significant linear relationship, rather than a curvilinear relationship, was found to exist between R-S and this measure of personal adjustment.

Thelen (1969) also investigated the relationship between R-S and adjustment for college students who sought psychotherapy, compared to a control group who did not. He, too,

employed the CPI as the measure of personal adjustment. There were two important findings from this study. First, those who sought psychotherapy had significantly higher scores on the R-S scale than those who did not. And, second, when the therapy-seeking group and the non-therapy-seeking group were equated for adjustment, the therapy-seeking group were found to be significantly higher in sensitization. In regards to this latter finding, Thelen stated that "Perhaps the R-S scale measures[sic] 'adjustment' as well as the tendency to approach or avoid stress. Such a relationship does not make the terms interchangeable and certainly does not reduce the value of the R-S concept" (p. 164).

Byrne, Blaylock, and Goldberg (1966) tested the hypothesis that the personality dynamics of the repressor, which are characterized by repressing and denying defense mechanisms, would fit the personality pattern associated with dogmatism. R-S was correlated with dogmatism, measured by Rokeach's Dogmatism and Opinionation Scales, in two independent samples. The relationship between dogmatism and R-S was found to be both significant and positive in the independent samples. Thus, dogmatism was found to relate more strongly to sensitizing defenses than to repressing defenses. The authors presented two possible interpretations to explain this unpredicted relationship. First, that while dogmatism might serve as a defense against anxiety, the specific defenses employed are sensitizing rather than repressing.

Second, that the close-minded or dogmatic person has basic beliefs that man is alone, isolated, and helpless -- and that this theme is also reflected by the sensitizing person. The authors conclude, "Thus, the dogmatic, sensitizing, personally unhappy individual tends to express negative feelings toward self and toward others" (p. 741).

Gayton and Bernstein (1969) investigated two issues raised by R-S theory and previous R-S research. They also assessed Byrne's hypothesis that R-S would be related in a curvilinear fashion to personal adjustment. They investigated specific areas of personal conflict via Trehub's ego-disjunction measure of incompatible needs. Briefly, Trehub's measure is an index arrived from responses to the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Eight of the EPPS's scales are grouped into four pairs of conflicting needs, "deference-aggression, autonomy-abasement, succorance-nurturance, and order-change" (p. 192). The joint magnitude of each of these pairs is used as a measure of incompatible need strength. The results of this investigation supported the previously established linear relationship between R-S and personal adjustment. Additionally, it identified only two of the four need-pairs as contributors to this incompatibility in need strength: succorance-nurturance and autonomy-abasement. The remaining need-pairs showed no such need discrepancy. Thus, the need areas of succorance-nurturance and autonomy-abasement might be tentatively indentified as areas of particular conflict for those at the sensitizing end of the R-S dimension.

In an attempt to assess the extent that R-S might relate to a differential incidence of physical illness, Byrne, Steinberg, and Schwartz (1968) examined both a self-rated incidence of illness and an incidence of illness based upon visits made to a student health center. The prediction was made that both repressors and sensitizers would have a greater incidence of illness than would neutrals. Instead, a linear relationship was found between R-S and both measures, at least for the male student sample. Thus, in this study both the self-assessment and the behavioral assessment of physical illness were found to be related linearly to R-S.

Up to this point I have reviewed several investigations that dealt with the relationship of R-S to measures of (1) self-perception, (2) person perception, and (3) personal adjustment. Now, this review will focus upon studies that are essentially concerned with R-S as related to group process and group outcome variables.

Group Process

One of the earliest investigations that attempted to study the relationship between R-S and group functioning was by Joy (1963). Subsequent to establishing that R-S correlated $-.87$ with leadership (as measured by an MMPI scale) Joy arranged experimental problem-solving groups. These groups were each composed of three members: a repressor, a sensitizer, and a neutral. Each group was assigned a human relations problem as a group discussion task. Following this

group interaction, each of the group members rated himself and the other two members on a number of variables. There were two important findings. First, on the ratings of others, the sensitizers were significantly less often chosen to be work partners. Second, the repressors rated themselves to be more concerned for maintaining friendly group relations than did the sensitizers.

Perhaps the first study that related R-S to a short-term, non-experimentally created, group was that by Turk (1963). In this investigation he examined the congruence of self-rating and rating of others in student nurse and student physician teams. The student nurses were the only dyad members that were identified on the R-S dimension. These physician-nurse teams worked together in a clinic for a period of three weeks. The dependent variable under study was the perceived "enjoyment" by each of the dyad members during this work experience. Each of the subjects rated himself and the other dyad member on a multi-faceted questionnaire. A significant correlation was found to exist between R-S and the rating of other for task enjoyment, only when the nurse being rated was a sensitizer. That is, the self-rating of enjoyment for repressor nursing students was not accurately perceived by the doctors with whom they worked, while it was so for sensitizer nursing students. A second important finding was the existence of a significantly greater assumed similarity of other rating for the repressor nurse group than for

the sensitizer group. That is, the sensitizer nurse assumed a greater difference between herself and her dyad partner than did the repressor nurse. Parsons and Fulgenzi (1968) followed up early findings in R-S research to examine the developing conclusion that "hostility is of special importance in this personality dimension" (p. 537). Subjects in this study were identified via the HOS into three groups: repressors, sensitizers and neutrals. Two separate procedures were employed to determine if these groups differed in their expression of hostility. The first procedure involved the administration of the group Rorschach. The second procedure involved the formation of five-person groups of heterogeneous R-S composition that subsequently engaged in a group story construction task. During this latter task, experienced judges rated each group member's interpersonal behavior on several behavior rating scales. Finally, each of the group members rated all other group members on a twenty-five-item scale. The findings showed no significant differences among the three R-S groups on the hostility score derived from their Rorschach protocol. However, on the behavior ratings by the judges, repressors were assessed to be significantly more aggressive and hostile than were sensitizers. Supporting this finding were the ratings from each of the group members as they too consistently rated the repressor as more aggressive and hostile than the sensitizer.

Parsons, Fulgenzi, and Edelburg (1969) report a study which investigates this problem area by comparing the self-

assessment, behavioral-assessment, and psychophysiological assessment of a specific interpersonal interaction. Again, they utilized five-person discussion groups. The group majority was structured so that an equal number of groups would have repressors or sensitizers as predominate. Two independent investigations were then carried out. The first was essentially a replication of the previously reported experiment, Parsons and Fulgenzi (1968). The results of this part of the study were also in agreement with the earlier study; i.e. (1) repressors rated themselves to be less aggressive than sensitizers rated themselves, and (2) there was greater discrepancy between the judges' rating of aggression and the self-ratings of aggression for the repressors. The authors concluded this part of the study with the observation that these repeatedly established findings "provide an experimental analogue to the psychotherapeutic encounter " (p. 239). That is, like some therapy clients, the repressor reveals behavioral signs of hostility and aggressiveness but does not report a parallel state of emotional arousal, while the sensitizer, who does not reveal such behavioral assertiveness, reports that he is in fact quite emotionally aroused.

This repeatedly observed discrepancy between overt behavior and self-assessed emotional experience, resulted in the subsequent study that made a psychophysiological measure of the emotional state of repressors and sensitizers. Five-person groups, with either repressors or sensitizers in

majority, engaged in a half-hour discussion while (1) their skin conductance responses (SCRs) were recorded, (2) their interaction was rated for aggressiveness of behavior, and (3) their verbal behavior was recorded. The results show the repressors to have a higher level of aggressive behavior, that was in turn accompanied by a higher level of SCRs, while the sensitizers had a lower level of aggressiveness that was accompanied by a lower level of SCRs. The authors follow by stating,

Repressors, then, appear to be highly involved, both by behavioral and psychophysiological criteria, in the group discussion, goal oriented (getting on with the task), and perceived by others as aggressive but not reporting themselves as aggressive. The sensitizers are less aggressive and not as affectively aroused at least as measured by the SCR. On the other hand, they rate themselves higher than repressors on aggressiveness and hostility but are not so rated by others. (p. 242)

When these empirical relationships were evaluated in the terms of Lacey's (1959) "transactional" interpretation of autonomic responses, the inference was presented that repressors were more task and goal oriented, while the sensitizers were more oriented to the emotional quality of the interpersonal relationships.

A study by Wilkins and Epting (1971) provides findings that relate to the issue of differential interpersonal orientation between sensitizers and repressors. They employed Bierer's Interpersonal Cognitive Complexity (ICC) measure to differentiate the nature of interpersonal orientation related

to R-S. According to the authors,

Interpersonal Cognitive Complexity is defined in terms of the degree of differentiation between the dimensions of a construct system. A construct system which highly differentiates among persons in the social environment is considered to be cognitively complex in structure. On the other hand, a construct system which poorly differentiates among persons is considered to be cognitively simple. (p. 1)

The authors predicted that the sensitizer, with obsessive traits, would manifest interpersonal complexity, and that the repressor, with traits of avoidance, would manifest interpersonal simplicity. The results supported these predictions. These findings were interpreted to reveal that repressors are less discriminating in their interpersonal orientation than are sensitizers. These findings also support the inference from the previous study (Parsons et al.) -- that sensitizers are particularly attuned to the interpersonal quality of social events, while repressors are not.

Cohen and Foerst (1968) present evidence that supports the second inference from Parsons et al. that repressors are more goal directed in problem-solving situations. It has previously been shown that some personality variables are related to differences in group performance. Thus, it is appropriate to assess whether R-S too has such a relationship. In this study, experimental groups were homogeneously composed of either five sensitizers or five repressors. They were situated in a structured communication network and asked to participate in group problem-solving tasks. The

main findings were summarized by the authors as follows, "R groups formed appropriate problem-solving systems earlier than S groups, had faster times in performing tasks, and exhibited greater continuity of leadership " (p. 214).

These results seemed consistent with the inference by Parsons et al. that the repressor may be more goal oriented and less vulnerable than the sensitizer to interpersonal distraction.

Two studies by Cohen and Carrera (1967) and Carrera and Cohen (1968) also relate R-S to aspects of a problem-solving interaction. They utilized five-person experimental groups homogeneously composed of repressors or sensitizers. Both investigations involved group interaction that led to experiences of group success or group failure. Both studies had similar procedures and results, thus the second study might be essentially thought of as a replication of the first. Although there was a tendency for "extreme" sensitizers to verbalize more hostility subsequent to a failure experience, there were no significant differences in affect, nor in judgments concerning their performance, for either repressors or sensitizers subsequent to group failure or group success. The general conclusions inferred from this absence of measured difference in verbal behavior and in evaluative judgments were as follows:

It was suggested that group factors may constitute a set of mitigating conditions that intervene between the induction of stimuli and their effects on the manifest productions of personality (p. 221),

and,

In both studies the repression-sensitization variable proved to be of relatively minor importance for interpersonal behavior within the context of small groups. (p. 13)

In contrast to studies that related individual response tendencies to R-S, the studies by Carrera and Cohen indicate crucial limitations in the value of R-S as a relevant variable in small group interaction. The following section will discuss this crucial implication as related to the present study as well as several general findings presented in this selected review of R-S research.

Implications for Present Research

Several conclusions and implications can be distinguished in the previous R-S investigations. First, and most comprehensively, the R-S construct has shown both theoretically and empirically congruent relationships with several other psychological constructs and measures. Second, the R-S instrument, the Health and Opinion Survey, has evidenced good reliability and construct validity. Third, the R-S concept has been found useful in delineating features of individual response tendency and in delineating some features of small group interaction.

In addition to these very general positive features of R-S research, several limitations and areas of neglect can also be identified. First, because of the very nature of the R-S variable, self-rated assessments need to be related to more objective modes assessing the same behavior. Second, few R-S studies have directed attention to the behavior of

the intermediate scorers (Neutrals) as related to extreme scorers (Repressors and Sensitizers). Third, while there have been only a few efforts to study the relationship of R-S to aspects of small group or dyadic process, the inference has been reported that the R-S variable is of little significance in group interaction.

These general findings and limitations in R-S research provide grist for the present investigation. The observation is presented that previous studies of small group interaction have been based almost exclusively on artificially organized "experimental" groups. These groups did not have the characteristics of being (1) naturally found, (2) self-selected, nor (3) were they of a long-term nature. It is argued that if R-S were a valuable dimension in group process and outcome, that the study of natural groups, embodying the just enumerated characteristics, would be very desirable. As stated by Byrne,

Any pervasive personality variable such as repression-sensitization, is potentially an important determiner of some aspects of interpersonal behavior. An individual's socially relevant motives, his perceptions of others, his response to the demands of group situations, and his effect on others are likely to be in part a function of his characteristic defense modes. (1964, p. 203)

The formulation of defense modes has been of long-standing interest and value in personality theory. However, there seems to have been little attempt to measure and study these defense modes as they relate to aspects of interpersonal

relationships. The general purpose of the present study is thus to investigate various R-S findings and inferences as related to aspects of a particular interpersonal relationship - the marital dyad.

Study of R-S in the Marital Relationship

The current study utilized the marital dyad in the examination of several factors relevant to R-S; those factors being (1) marital adjustment, (2) the perception of satisfaction and stress in marriage in a college setting, (3) the resolution of marital conflicts, (4) self-perception, and (5) spouse-perception. The marital dyad was chosen as the relationship of focus for several critical reasons which will not be discussed. Previous R-S research has been concerned, among other variables, with the relationship of R-S to the perception of aggression in self and other group members and with the effectiveness of group performance. The groups utilized in these studies were experimentally created, and as such they differ considerably from naturally formed groups. It is argued that if individual differences, measured in terms of R-S, do reveal differential effects in these experimental groups, then such differences should be even more manifest in long-term naturally formed groups. Also, it seems evident that the resolution of conflict is a feature of all but perhaps the most casual or formalized relationship, and that probably few relationships could involve the extent of conflict resolution that would occur in

the marital dyad. Thus, the marital dyad, where an individual functions intensively and extensively in a self-chosen relationship, appears to provide a most excellent natural group for the investigation of hypotheses drawn from R-S research.

It has been argued that the marital dyad represents a particularly good setting for the investigation of issues drawn from the R-S literature. The following section presents the reasoning involved in the several areas that will later be delineated by specific hypotheses.

It has been reported (Byrne, 1964) that social desirability scores are highly correlated with R-S scores. This relationship is one in which those with repressor scores also have high social desirability scores, while those with sensitizer scores have very low social desirability scores. The picture is presented that the repressor, with a high social desirability set, is one who would like to think of himself in very positive terms - while the sensitizer operates with the very opposite orientation. It would then be expected that the repressor would paint a very positive picture of himself and his marital relationship on a self-rated instrument - while the sensitizer would be expected to do the opposite.

Earlier studies have also shown that the repressor rated himself low in aggressive behavior in a group interaction, but that he is rated by both co-acting peers and observing

judges as high in aggressive behavior. The sensitizer presents quite the opposite picture -- he rates himself to be high in aggressive behavior, but he is rated by peers and judges as manifesting little aggression. An important fact here is that comparable ratings have been given by both the interacting peers and the judges. In a marital conflict-resolution situation it would be expected that the greater aggressiveness of the repressor would be revealed by his judgment being accepted more frequently than the sensitizer's judgment. In this situation the sensitizer would also be expected to rate himself as being more aggressive than he is perceived to be by his mate, and the repressor would be expected to rate himself as less aggressive than he is perceived to be by his mate.

In summary up to this point, the R-S construct refers to a dimension of individual differences in reactivity to emotionally arousing stimuli - especially those of an aversive nature. There are two most central features of the poles of this dimension. The first is characterized as a bias to operate toward (repressor), or away from (sensitizer), socially desirable responses, while the second is characterized as the lack of correspondence between how the repressor and sensitizer perceive aspects of their behavior and how they are perceived by others. It is argued that the examination of responses made by neutrals (those who have intermediate scores on the R-S scale) may provide a new perspective

when related to these and to other aspects of the R-S picture. The neutral can be viewed as one who does not operate with the degree of positive or negative response bias as the sensitizer or repressor. Consequently the ratings made by the neutral, of his marital relationship, should be less distorted than those made by the repressor and the sensitizer. Therefore, the most objective evaluation of the quality of a marriage between a repressor and a neutral, or between a sensitizer and a neutral, would be expected to be that made by the neutral spouse.

The marital ratings received from the neutral should thus establish a clear-cut test of Byrne's cornerstone assumption that R-S is related curvilinearly to adjustment and well-being. That is, the excessive avoidance or approach modes of defensive behavior of the repressor or sensitizer spouse is predicted to limit the adjustment and satisfaction partners in the marital dyad could achieve. Therefore, neutrals would be expected to report more satisfaction in a marriage with another neutral than in a marriage with either a repressor or a sensitizer spouse.

Also, from previous R-S research, it was shown that the perception of enjoyment in a dyadic working relationship is much more accurate when the perceptual target is a sensitizer than when the target is a repressor. It would be expected that the sensitizer spouse will be more congruently evaluated by his mate, than will the repressor spouse, on a measure of environmental stress and satisfaction.

Finally, the inference reported by Carrera and Cohen, that R-S is a variable of relatively minor importance in small group interaction, could be evaluated on the basis of whether there are significant relationships established between R-S and the several dependent measures in the present investigation.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

The program of this experimental research began with the identification of marital dyad partners in terms of their R-S scores on the Health and Opinion Survey (HOS). Sixty couples who had been married for at least one year, and in which at least one member was a University of Florida student, were needed for this study. Prospective couples were personally contacted and asked to respond to the HOS. This procedure was followed until the six experimental cells, presented below, were represented by ten couples each. The experimental cells consisted of dyads with all possible combinations of repressor (R), sensitizier (S), and neutral (N) mates. According to the most common practice in R-S research, subjects were identified as repressors if their score was below 39, as sensitizers if it was above 55, and as neutrals if their score fell between 39 and 55. Thus the following cells were represented:

Mate 1	Mate 2
R	R
R	N
R	S
N	N
N	S
S	S

Instruments

The Health and Opinion Survey (Byrne, 1963) was used to identify sensitizers, repressors, and neutrals. This instrument is composed of 127 out of 182 possible items from six Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory scales (D,L,K, Hy, Pt, and Welsch Anxiety). The deletion of some of these 182 items was initiated by Byrne to eliminate the item overlap of earlier R-S scales. This revised R-S instrument, HOS, has shown a Brown-Spearman corrected split-half reliability of .94 and a three month test-retest correlation of .82 (Byrne, 1963).

The Inventory of Marital Conflict (IMC) by Olson (1969) is comprised of 18 vignettes designed to induce conflict in problem resolution between the husband and wife on 12/18 stories, and to induce agreement in spousal judgments on the remaining 6/18. Each spouse is asked to individually read the vignettes, which describe relatively common conflict experiences that a couple may have, and assign a judgment of responsibility for the described problem. After the spouses individually assess problem responsibility, they must jointly reach a single judgment as a couple. Twelve of the eighteen vignettes are written such that spouses are led to believe that different story characters are in the wrong. Six of

the 18 vignettes are written so that both spouses will judge the same story character as being in the wrong.

A "Win" index was derived based upon which spouse's opinion was accepted during the joint resolution of the 12/18 conflict vignettes. Winning was determined by whose decision was jointly endorsed when the husband and wife differed in their individual judgments. The win index was computed by awarding each spouse one point when his individual judgment was later endorsed by his mate in the joint resolution. This sum was then divided by the total number of stories that they differed upon. It is inferred from this index which spouse is the more aggressive and which the more submissive in the conflict resolution interaction.

Further information will now be presented regarding aspects of the construction and validation of the IMC. The conflict situation in each vignette is presented with slight differences in slant regarding the information that each spouse of the experimental dyad receives. Thus a delicate balance must be attained so that a difference in the assignment of responsibility for the described conflict situation could be achieved without having the couple realize that they had in fact been misled. The judgment that this desired balance has been achieved can be substantiated by data provided by the IMC author (Olson, 1969). For example, on the story situations designed to produce a conflict in judgments, 86 percent of the stories designed to produce conflicting judgments did so. In general, the IMC represents

a significant improvement in assessing interaction in a conflict resolution situation over its more widely known predecessor - Strodtbeck's Revealed Difference Technique (1951).

Behavior Rating Scales. Following the IMC interaction, each spouse filled out an eight scale assessment of interpersonal behavior. They rated both themselves and their spouse on each of the scales. These 8 scales represent categories defined by Bales (1950) in the Interaction Process Analysis, and modified by Parsons et al. (1969). Five of the scales assess aggressive behavior (scales 4-8), and three assess non-aggressive, but interaction-relevant behavior (scales 1-3).

The Locke-Wallace "Short Marital Adjustment Test" (1959) is a fifteen-item inventory composed of selected items from marital inventories which proved to have the highest discriminative value and which did not seem to overlap other items in content. The authors have presented evidence that their shortened inventory has essentially the same reliability as the longer form. The range of scores possible to achieve is from 2 to 158 points.

The Marriage and College Environment Inventory (MACE) by Clarke (1969) is a recently devised instrument for married couples wherein either one or both of the mates are college students. It is designed to assess the extent to which various personal and interpersonal aspects of the marriage experience and features of the college environment are viewed as sources

of stress or satisfaction. The MACE is composed of 175 items, has both a husband and wife form, and is designed for the spouses to complete alone without consultation with each other. There are four possible response categories available for each of the 175 items: (1) Non-applicable, (2) Generally satisfactory, (3) Generally stressful, and (4) Neither.

The MACE was administered on two separate occasions to each subject. The first administration requested each subject to respond to the MACE statements on the basis of his own feelings. A proportion score was generated from these responses by dividing the number of items that he rated as "Generally stressful" by the number of items that he rated as "Generally satisfactory." This proportion score was termed the MACE stress/satisfaction ratio. The higher this ratio is, the greater the amount of stress the subject is experiencing.

On the second administration of the MACE, the subject was requested to respond on the basis of how he perceived his spouse to feel. A second score was thus derived by comparing each subject's own responses to the MACE with the responses ascribed to him by his spouse. This resulting score was termed the MACE agreement score. This score was arithmetically computed by summing one point for each MACE statement that was responded to similarly by the subject's self-rating and by his spouse's rating of him. This sum was then divided by the total number of responses that fell in the "Generally stressful" and "Generally satisfactory" categories for that

person. The MACE agreement score could thus serve as a statistic for comparing the degree of congruency between a person's self-rated feelings and his spouse's perception of his feelings.

Procedure

The 60 couples, 10 couples in each cell, who participated in this study, were selected from names provided by the Registrar at the University of Florida. This list included all persons who were then currently enrolled married students. Couples were randomly selected from this list and asked to participate in a research project. This project was described as a study of aspects of college married life.

Initial contact with each prospective subject couple was made by the investigator at the subjects' home. It was felt that such personal contact would maximally encourage a positive attitude toward participation in the study. If the couple were willing to participate in the investigation, a date and time were agreed upon for the investigator to return with the initial questionnaires, i. e. HOS, MACE, and Locke-Wallace. To insure non-collaborative responses on these measures, the couples were asked to fill out the questionnaires with the investigator present. At the end of this first phase of testing, the couples were informed that they might be contacted in the near future for the purposes of an unrelated investigation that would provide a nominal remuneration (\$4.00). This reference to a future investigation was actually an attempt to promote participation in the second phase of the study.

Couples who were identified as having the desired combination of R-S scores were then contacted by telephone to participate in the second phase of data collection, i. e. IMC, Bales' rating scales, and MACE. This final phase of data collection was again carried out in the subjects' home, while the investigator was present. The subjects were first given the 18 vignettes of the IMC and asked individually to assign responsibility for the described problem situations. Upon completion of this task, the couple was brought together in order to make a mutually endorsed assignment of responsibility for the same 18 vignettes. They were next asked to rate themselves and their mate on the 8 Bales' scales in regards to their behavior during conflict resolution. Lastly, they again responded to the MACE; however, this time they responded the way that they thought their spouse would respond.

As a comment on the apparent effectiveness of these procedures to enlist cooperation, it can be noted that it only took contact with 62 couples, having the desired combination of R-S scores, to fill the 6 experimental cells of 10 couples each. The total number of couples who were tested in order to identify those having the desired R-S combinations was 197.

Analysis

The statistics appropriate for testing the hypotheses of this study were derived from analyses of variance with planned comparisons of cell means. Further statistics were computed with multiple comparisons made among the R-S dyads

using an extension of Duncan's New Multiple Range Test. The dependent variables for these analyses were as follows: (1) Locke-Wallace, (2) MACE stress/satisfaction ratio, (3) MACE agreement score, (4) IMC "Win" index, (5) Self-ratings on the Bales scales (4-8), and (6) Ratings - of - Spouse on the Bales scales (4-8). The experimental cells were as follows:

Dyad	Mate 1	Mate 2
RR	R	R
RN	R	N
RS	R	S
NN	N	N
NS	N	S
SS	S	S

Hypotheses

Hypothesis (1) Since repressors have been shown to evaluate themselves in a very positive light while sensitizers operate with the opposite orientation -- it was predicted that the repressor would rate his marriage more positively than would the sensitizer.

The mean of the Locke-Wallace marital adjustment score for each of the repressor mates in the RR, RS, and RN dyads was combined into a total repressor mean. This mean was then compared with the comparable total sensitizer mean (from the sensitizer mate's mean in RS, SS, and SN dyads).

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean Locke-Wallace score for repressors will be greater than for sensitizers at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (2) Since the sensitizer and repressor operate with extremes in defensive behavior, this characteristic was expected to limit the quality of marital adjustment.

It would be expected that marriage with a sensitizer or repressor would be less satisfactory than marriage with a neutral. To limit the response bias that seems to characterize the repressor and sensitizer, the evaluations of only neutral spouses, in RN, SN, and NN dyads, were compared.

The Locke-Wallace marital adjustment scores for each of the neutral mates in the NN dyad were combined into a total neutral mean. This mean was compared with both the mean of the neutral spouse in the RN dyad and the mean of the neutral spouse in the SN dyad.

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean Locke-Wallace score for neutrals with a neutral spouse will be greater than for neutrals with a sensitizer spouse and for neutrals with a repressor spouse at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (3) In reporting their perceptions of stresses and satisfactions, the repressor operates with a response bias toward positive reporting. The repressor selectively remembers and reports more of the good than the bad, while the sensitizer has the opposite orientation.

The MACE stress/satisfaction ratio for each of the repressor mates in RR, RS, and RN dyads was combined into a total repressor mean. This mean was compared with the comparable total sensitizer mean (from the sensitizer mates in RS, SS, and SN dyads).

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean MACE stress/satisfaction ratio for sensitizers will be greater than for repressors at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (4) Since the sensitizier and repressor are defined as operating with extremes in defensive behavior, this quality would be expected to limit the satisfaction that can be achieved in their marriage. Therefore, it is predicted that a marriage with a sensitizier or repressor will be less satisfactory than a marriage with a neutral. To control for the response bias that characterizes both the sensitizier and repressor, only the evaluations of neutral spouses in RN, SN, and NN dyads will be compared.

The MACE stress/satisfaction ratio for each of the neutral mates in the NN dyad were combined into a total neutral mean. This mean was compared with both the mean of the neutral spouses in the RN dyad and with the mean of the neutral spouses in the SN dyad.

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean MACE stress/satisfaction ratio for neutrals with a neutral spouse will be less than for neutrals with a sensitizier spouse and for neutrals with a repressor spouse at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (5) Because of the reported greater aggressiveness in interpersonal interactions, the repressor will prevail in having his judgment accepted in an ambiguous situation, when his mate is a sensitizier.

The mean IMC "Win index" scores for the repressors in RS dyads were compared to that of their sensitizier mates.

Thus it was predicted that: The mean IMC "Win index" score for repressors will be greater than for sensitizers at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (6) The sensitizer assesses himself to be more aggressive in interpersonal relationships than he is rated by others. The opposite relationship is expected to occur for the repressors, who rates himself to be less aggressive than he is rated by others.

A "Difference Score" was computed for each of the dyad members by subtracting each person's self-rating of aggressiveness by his spouse's rating of aggressiveness in him (Bales' scales 4-8). The mean of this absolute difference was figured for all of the repressors in RR, RS, and RN dyads. A comparable mean was figured for all of the sensitizers in RS, NS, and SS dyads.

Thus, it was predicted that: The Difference score for repressor and sensitizer dyads will not be significantly different from each other at the .05 level.

Hypothesis (7) Repressors perceive themselves to be less aggressive in interpersonal interaction than sensitizers perceive themselves to be. Others rate the repressor as being more aggressive in interpersonal interaction than they rate the sensitizer to be.

(7) (A) The self-ratings of aggressiveness for each of the repressor mates in the RR, RS, and RN dyads were combined into a total repressor mean (Bales' scales 4-8). This mean was compared with the comparable total sensitizer self-rating mean (from the sensitizer mate means in RS, SS, and SN dyads).

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean self-rating of aggressiveness for sensitizers will be greater than for repressors at the .05 level.

(7) (B) The mean of the rating-of-spouse scores on the Bales' scales (4-8) from the repressors' mates in RR, RS, and RN dyads were combined into a total mean. This mean was compared with the comparable rating-of-spouse scores from the sensitizers' mates (in the RS, SS, and SN dyads).

It was predicted that: The mean rating-of-spouse score for aggressiveness given by the repressor's mate, will be greater than that given by the sensitizer's mate.

Hypothesis (8) Since the sensitizer had been shown to have his feelings regarding his job experiences more accurately perceived than is true of the repressor, the sensitizer's feelings of marital and environmental stress and satisfaction are expected to be more accurately perceived by his partner. Thus, the sensitizer's self-ratings and the ratings of him by his spouse should be more congruent than is the case for the repressor's self-ratings and the ratings of him by his spouse.

The means of the "agreement" scores computed from the MACE, for each of the repressor mates in the RR, RS, and RN dyads, were combined into a total repressor score. This mean was compared with the comparable total sensitizer "agreement" mean (from the sensitizer mate means in RS, SS, and SN dyads).

Thus, it was predicted that: The mean MACE "agreement" score for sensitizers will be greater than for repressors at the .05 level.

In addition to the above hypotheses where differences between repressors and sensitizers were predicted, there were additional comparisons made between the neutral's score and those of the sensitizer and repressor. These additional comparisons were made on the following dependent measures: Locke-Wallace, IMC "Win" index, Bales' self-ratings, Bales' ratings-of-spouses, MACE self-ratings, and MACE agreement score. These comparisons were primarily included to shed light on whether or not a curvilinear relationship exists between these variables and R-S.

Further data are also referenced in Appendix F, Tables 1 to 6. These tables include additional information that will be drawn upon in the final Discussion section.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The data which comprise the results of this research will be presented in a format wherein statistics which are appropriate for a specific test of each enumerated hypothesis are first reported. Following this explicit test of each hypothesis, any other aspects of the related data which may extend, amplify, or qualify the hypotheses and their findings will be referenced in the Appendices section.

Hypothesis (1) predicted that the mean Locke-Wallace score for repressors will be greater than for sensitizers. An analysis of variance of the data appropriate for a test of hypothesis (1) (Table 1) indicates support for the presence of a significant difference along the R-S dimension on this dependent measure. It can be shown by Table 2, which comprises the R-S category means and the planned comparison test, that the mean marital adjustment score for repressors is 117.6, for neutrals is 112.5, and for sensitizers is 91.9. Tests for significant differences between these means, reveal that the repressor and neutral are both significantly different from the sensitizer, and that they are not significantly different from each other.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance of Locke-Wallace Ratings for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	14,852.59	2	7,426.29	12.77	.05
Within Groups	68,063.56	117	581.74		
Total	82,916.13	119			

TABLE 2

Ranked Means of Locke-Wallace Ratings for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	S	91.875	S vs. R	.05
2	N	112.475		
3	R	117.625		

Hypothesis (2) predicted that the mean Locke-Wallace score for neutrals with a neutral spouse will be greater than for neutrals with a sensitizer or repressor spouse. This hypothesis was also concerned with the relationship between R-S and marital adjustment. It was conceptualized as an attempt to examine this relationship while concurrently controlling for the evaluative bias that characterizes the polar extremes of the R-S dimension. Table 3 represents the means and planned comparison tests among these means for the three

neutral dyads. It can be observed that there are no significant differences between the means for these three dyads. It can be seen that the neutral married to the sensitizer does have a lower marital adjustment rating than does the neutral married with either a neutral or a repressor. In these latter two dyads, the mean marital adjustment ratings are almost identical. The means of all R-S dyads, which enter into a more complete analysis of the marital adjustment ratings in the Discussion section, are presented in Appendix F, Table 1.

TABLE 3

Ranked Means of Locke-Wallace Ratings for
All Neutral Dyads

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	NS	107.90	NS vs. NN	n.s.
2	NR	113.80	NR vs. NN	n.s.
3	NN	114.10		

Hypothesis (3) predicted that the mean of the MACE stress/satisfaction ratio for sensitizers will be greater than for repressors. The analysis of variance presented in Table 4 indicates support for the existence of a significant difference along the R-S dimension on this measure. It can be seen by examining the means; repressors = 0.277, neutrals =

0.428, and sensitizers = 0.602, and planned comparisons presented in Table 5, that not only do the sensitizers and repressors differ as predicted, but also that they both differ significantly from the neutrals. The neutrals can be seen to occupy an intermediate position between that of the sensitizers and repressors. Further data are presented in Appendix F, Table 2, of a complete breakdown which permits additional comparisons between each dyad on the basis of its MACE ratio.

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio
for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	2.12	2	1.06	10.66	.05
Within Groups	11.63	117	0.10		
Total	13.75	119			

TABLE 5

Ranked Means of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	R	0.277	R vs. N	.05
2	N	0.428	N vs. S	.05
3	S	0.602	S vs. R	.05

Hypothesis (4) again argued from the perspective that neutral persons, being characterized as not operating with either extreme of defensiveness, should evidence a smaller mean MACE stress/satisfaction ratio with a neutral spouse, than with either a repressor spouse or a sensitizer spouse. It can be seen from the means and planned comparison test data presented in Table 6, that the predicted curvilinear relationship between R-S and these MACE scores is not supported, but rather that a linear relationship is supported. Although the difference between NR and NN dyads is not significant, it is in the direction of a direct linear relationship. The other two comparisons reveal significant differences and further establish the linear relationship between R-S and the ratio of perceived stress to perceived satisfaction.

TABLE 6

Ranked Means of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for
Neutrals in NR, NN, and NS Dyads

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	NR	0.297	NR vs. NN	n.s.
2	NN	0.370	NN vs. NS	.05
3	NS	0.674	NS vs. NR	.05

Hypothesis (5) predicted that the mean IMC "Win index" score for repressors will be greater than for sensitizers in the RS dyad. The diametrically opposite relationship was found to occur, as can be seen from the planned comparison test data as presented in Table 7. Here it is shown that the sensitizer was successful in having his initial judgment endorsed by his repressor spouse in 63 percent of the conflict situations. Further data in Appendix F, Table 3, reveal that for all other marital dyads, each person was successful approximately half the time in having his initial judgment endorsed by his spouse.

TABLE 7

Ranked Means of IMC "Win Index" for
Both Mates in RS Dyad

Rank	Label	Mean	P
1	<u>RS</u> ¹	36.79	.05
2	<u>RS</u>	63.21	

¹The underlined letter in the RS dyad label indicates that the data are for the spouse with that particular R-S classification.

Hypothesis (6) predicted that a discrepancy would exist between the self-rating of aggressiveness by sensitizers and repressors and the rating of them by their respective spouses, but that the absolute value of this discrepancy would not be significantly different from each other. It can be seen by the planned comparison test data in Table 8 and 9,

that there was a significant difference between the discrepancy scores for repressors and sensitizers. It can be seen that for the sensitizer there was a difference in self-rated aggressiveness that averaged 2.30 from his spouse, while the average discrepancy between the repressor's self-assessment and his spouse's assessment was 0.03. That is, the sensitizer was shown to have a significantly greater discrepancy in the perception of aggressiveness for himself relative to his mate's assessment of him than is true for the repressor. There was essentially no discrepancy between the repressor's self-rating and his mate's rating of him. It can also be seen that the neutral occupies a position essentially halfway between that of the repressor and that of the sensitizer. Further data relevant to a more complete discussion of these findings are referenced in Appendix F, Table 4.

TABLE 8

Ranked Means of Bales' "Difference Score" for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	R	0.03	R vs. S	.05
2	N	1.20		
3	S	2.30		

TABLE 9

Analysis of Variance of Bales' "Difference Score"
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	103.55	2	51.77	3.34	.05
Within Groups	1,809.76	117	15.47		
Total	1,913.31	119			

Hypothesis (7) (A) predicted that the mean Bales self-ratings of aggressiveness by sensitizers would be greater than those by repressors. It can be seen by the analysis of variance presented in Table 10 that there are significant differences between the R-S categories with respect to the Bales dependent measure. Further, in Table 11, the means and planned comparison tests show that the sensitizer's self-rating of 12.55 is significantly greater than the repressor rating of 9.85. It can also be seen that the neutral occupies a position that is approximately midway between the sensitizer's and repressor's means.

Hypothesis (7) (B) involved the prediction that the mean Bales ratings given for the repressor would be greater than those given for the sensitizer. There was no significant main effect revealed by the analysis of variance in Table 12 on this dependent variable. Further, it can be seen by the means presented in Table 13, repressor = 9.83, neutral = 9.83,

and sensitizer = 10.08, that there was essentially no difference among the ratings given by their respective spouses for all three R-S groupings.

TABLE 10

Analysis of Variance of Bales' (4-8) Self-Ratings for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	146.61	2	73.31	7.85	.05
Within Groups	1,091.96	117	9.33		
Total	1,238.57	119			

TABLE 11

Ranked Means of Bales' (4-8) for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	R	9.85	R vs. S	.05
2	N	11.03		
3	S	12.55		

TABLE 12

Analysis of Variance of Bales' (4-8) Rating-of-Spouse Score for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	35.62	8	4.45	0.38	n.s.
Within Groups	1,306.24	111	11.77		
Total	1,341.86	119			

TABLE 13

Ranked Means of Bales' (4-8) Rating-of-Spouse Score
for Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean
1	R	9.83
2	N	9.83
3	S	10.08

Hypothesis (8) predicted that the mean MACE "Agreement score" for sensitizers would be greater than for repressors. While it can be seen by the analysis of variance presented in Table 14 that a significant main effect was found, it is shown by the means in Table 15 that it is in the opposite direction than what was predicted. It will be observed that the sensitizer with a score of .64 reveals a lower level of congruence with his mate's rating of him than is the case with the repressor, who has a rating of .71.

TABLE 14

Analysis of Variance of MACE "Agreement Score" for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Source	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Among Groups	0.12	2	0.06	5.21	.05
Within Groups	1.30	117	0.01		
Total	1.42	119			

TABLE 15

Ranked Means of MACE "Agreement Score" for
Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	S	0.64	S vs. R	.05
2	N	0.70	N vs. S	.05
3	R	0.71		

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present investigation was principally concerned with examining the relationship of the R-S personality construct to aspects of the functioning of the marital dyad-marital satisfaction, the assessment of stress and satisfaction in the context of college marriage, the resolving of conflict situations, the perception of aggression in self and spouse, and the degree of congruency in the perception of a spouse's feelings. It was anticipated that the dependent variables related to R-S in this study would add new data to this research area. Also, it was expected that the particular nature of these experimentally established relationships would provide information relevant to crucial issues about the R-S construct itself. Some of these latter issues include the question of whether R-S is curvilinearly related to measures of "adjustment," whether R-S is essentially a "response bias," and whether the R-S construct is best thought to be a continuum of defense behaviors.

To aid in the discussion of the previously presented hypotheses, a brief description of each of the empirically established relationships will be presented.

Hypothesis (1) Repressors reported significantly better marital adjustment than did the sensitizers and neutrals.

Hypothesis (2) For all three R-S categories, repressors, neutrals, and sensitizers, the lower their spouse's R-S score, the better was their marital adjustment.

Hypothesis (3) Sensitizers reported significantly greater stress from their life situation, relative to their report of satisfaction, than did repressors and neutrals.

Hypothesis (4) For all three R-S categories, repressors, neutrals, and sensitizers, the lower their spouse's R-S score, the lower was their assessment of stress from their life situation.

Hypothesis (5) The sensitizer when married to the repressor prevailed in having his judgments endorsed by his repressor mate when both were confronted with ambiguous choice situations.

Hypothesis (6) The sensitizer perceived himself to be more aggressive in social situations than his mate perceived him to be. There was no such discrepancy in the case of the repressor.

Hypothesis (7) The sensitizer rated himself as behaving at a significantly more aggressive level than the repressor rated himself to be.

Hypothesis (8) The feelings that the repressor held about aspects of his life situation were more congruently perceived by his mate than was the case for the sensitizer.

The results from the first two hypotheses refer to findings concerning the relationship between R-S and marital adjustment. It was shown that the predicted inverse relationship between R-S and a self-rated measure of marital adjustment did occur. Thus, the person who scores at the repressing end of the R-S continuum rates his marital adjustment as significantly better than does the person at the sensitizing end of the R-S continuum. This finding lends support for the idea that R-S denotes a construct that is more general and comprehensive than previously considered. That is, the person who endorses feelings of personal distress also endorses feelings of situational stress and discomfort related to his marriage adjustment.

It was then predicted on the basis of Byrne's hypothesis of a curvilinear relationship existing between R-S and personal adjustment (Byrne et al. 1965) that marital adjustment would also be limited by the defenses characteristic of the extreme scorers on the R-S continuum. Thus, a person should have a better marital adjustment when his mate was a neutral than when his mate was either a repressor or sensitizer. Further, the evaluation of only the neutral mate was examined in this hypothesis because of the argument that the neutral's

perception should theoretically be less biased than the repressor's or sensitizer's. The predicted curvilinear relationship between R-S and marital adjustment was not supported. Instead, it can be seen by the examination of each of the sensitizer dyad groupings (Appendix F, Table 1) that there is a significantly better marital adjustment for sensitizers married to repressors, 104.7, than for those married to other sensitizers, 82.5. Differences between neutral and repressor dyad groupings do not reach a level of significance, although they do indicate the presence of the same linear trend. It thus appears that the quality of the sensitizers' adjustment is more affected by his spouse's personality characteristics, as assessed by R-S, than is the case for the neutral or repressor.

The finding that the neutral's marital adjustment is not curvilinearly related to his mate's R-S rating brings the arguments concerning the neutral's characteristics into question. It had been argued from a theoretical point of view that the neutral should be able to make the most objective assessment of an interpersonal relationship. This was based on Byrne's assumption that the neutral does not function with the extremes in defensiveness that characterize the repressor and sensitizer. However, previous research has failed to demonstrate the hypothesized curvilinear relationship between R-S and measures of adjustment (Byrne et al., 1965; Thelen, 1969; Gayton and Bernstein, 1969). In the present

investigation the curvilinearity hypothesis was again bereft of empirical substantiation. In fact, without exception, all of the dependent factors in this study were linearly related to R-S. In light of the repeated disconfirmation of the curvilinearity hypothesis, it follows that the subordinate assumption that the neutral is less "biased" than the repressor and sensitizer is without support.

However, there is a previously cited criticism that could be leveled at the finding of a linear relationship between R-S and any self-rated measure. Namely, that R-S could be said to merely represent a continuum of "response bias" to selectively endorse or deny statements of personal distress or difficulty. Furthermore, it could be argued that the reported relationship between R-S and marital adjustment merely reflects this response bias. However, there are salient reasons and findings that would argue against such an interpretation.

First, unlike the measures in several previous studies, the Locke-Wallace measure of marital adjustment used in the present investigation does not involve item-overlap in the independent and dependent instruments. Thus, the present findings are freer of this source of response bias than those studies where item-overlap was present.

Second, the further examination of SR, SN, and SS dyad groupings (Appendix F, Table 1) showed that the sensitizer indicates significantly less marital dissatisfaction when his

mate is a repressor than when his mate is a sensitizer or neutral. If only a "response bias" were operating it would be expected that the sensitizer would evaluate his marriage in relatively negative terms regardless of the R-S classification of his mate. It was further observed that the trend exists across all dyads such that the lower their mate's R-S score the better is their perceived marital adjustment. These findings provide a cogent reason for considering R-S to represent more than just a blind and automatic response bias that operates regardless of situational and interpersonal factors.

The two findings, that the sensitizer in general reveals a significantly lower self-rated marital adjustment than neutrals and repressors, but that he also has significantly and progressively better marital adjustment when married to a neutral or repressor rather than another sensitizer, would again seem to support an alternative interpretation to the idea that this relationship only represents a response bias. Instead it could be posited that R-S differentiates a generalized style of reactivity to both personal and interpersonal events, which in turn relates to experiencing both the impact and evaluation of these events in characteristic terms of stress-satisfaction and negativity-positivity. This conception of R-S seeks to expand upon a unidimensional understanding of the R-S construct in order to encompass the perceptual, physiological, cognitive, learning history, etc.,

aspects of R-S relevant behavior. While the prediction of specific behaviors related to this multidimensional conception of R-S requires further research efforts, there are areas where congruent patterns of findings are beginning to emerge. For example, the cited research by Parsons et al. (1969), Carrera and Cohen (1968), and Joy (1963) all reveal the repressor to function in a manner that was more "aggressive" during small group interaction than did the sensitizer. However, the sensitizer was shown by Altrocchi et al. (1964) to function with greater self-attributed hostility than did the repressor, and also to be more conflicted regarding the expression of hostility than repressors (Byrne et al., 1963). It seems however that this "aggressive" behavior on the part of the repressor is related to his orientation toward the development of effective problem-solving behavior (Parsons et al., 1969), while the "hostility" of the sensitizer seems related to his orientation toward the evaluation of the quality of the interpersonal relationships. This interpretation receives added support from the research by Wilkins and Epting (1971), who found the sensitizer to function with a more highly differentiated (cognitively complex) interpersonal system than was true of the repressor. Thus in terms of an understanding of R-S on the basis of a differential reactivity to interpersonal events, it would be interpreted from these studies that the repressor typically reacts more to the task demands of an interpersonal activity, while

the sensitizier characteristically reacts more to the quality of the interpersonal relationships. More data which relate to this conception of R-S can be gleaned from the examination of findings for hypothesis (3).

Hypothesis (3) referred to the data from the MACE. Again, attention should be given to the content and characteristics of this instrument, as it differs importantly from previous reported measures in R-S research. The MACE was described as a self-rating assessment of the "Generally stressful" and "Generally satisfactory" nature of experiences in response to specific features of life situations typical to married college students. As such, it differs from the perception of personal distress that characterizes the diagnostic orientation of MMPI-derived instruments. Essentially, it is oriented to the assessment of specific marriage experiences and environmental circumstances, not to the evaluation of disturbing personal behavior and feelings.

There is another crucial difference between what the MACE assesses and what the psychodiagnostic instruments, on which the R-S rating is based, assess. Namely, the MACE requests a person to evaluate features of his environment that are shared to greater or lesser extent by another person - his spouse. Thus, two persons are evaluating circumstances that are to some degree public and shared. For example, the following MACE items seem illustrative of this point as they ask a person to evaluate these features of his life:

"Associating with other married students, Monthly earnings relative to cost of living, and Extent to which we share free time." These items stand in contrast to typical HOS (MMPI-derived) items: "My hands and feet are usually warm enough, Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about, and At times I feel like swearing."

The difference in content and orientation of the MACE permits the opportunity to assess whether the differences between repressors and sensitizers, in their evaluation of personal events, also extend to their evaluation of marital-experiences and environmental events. It can be seen (Results, Table 5) that the sensitizer's pattern of assessing personal events as relatively more stressful also characterizes his assessment of specific marital circumstances. It thus appears that the sensitizer can be portrayed as a person who generally assesses both his own functioning and his life-situation as relatively stressful, while the repressor assesses his functioning and his life-situation as relatively satisfactory.

An important trend that emerges from examination of the MACE ratio for each of the dyads is that their rating of marital and environmental stressfulness increases directly with the R-S rating of one's mate. For example, in looking at the stress/satisfaction ratio for the three sensitizer dyad groupings (Appendix F, Table 2), the stressfulness rating is higher when the mate is a neutral than when the

mate is a repressor, and it is highest when the mate is a sensitizer. This general trend is apparent for each of the repressor, neutral, and sensitizer dyad groupings. It again appears that both the person's own R-S rating and that of his mate are influencing factors in the individual's perception of environmental stressfulness. Thus, the data derived from the MACE show results similar to those from the Locke-Wallace - that in a marital dyad both a person's R-S status and the R-S status of his mate relate to the over-all adjustment of their marital relationship.

The comparable findings from both the Locke-Wallace and MACE data, that marital adjustment is a function of the R-S scores of both spouses, add support to the following considerations: (1) that R-S represents more than a "response bias," and (2) that the same linear relationship that was found between R-S and the endorsement of personal distress exists between R-S and the endorsement of marital-environmental distress. This latter consideration, that persons who endorse feelings of personal distress also endorse feelings of situational distress, provides compelling support for the argument that R-S denotes a "generalized" reactivity to features of one's life.

The remainder of the hypotheses dealt with several questions pertaining to the relationship between R-S and aggressiveness in the marital dyad, and also to the question of congruency in the perception of one another's personal

feelings and attitudes as related to R-S. The first finding (Hypothesis 5, Table 7) that the sensitizer in the RS dyad was significantly more successful in having his individual judgment endorsed by his mate was opposite to the stated prediction. It would seem to be compatible with previous research which utilized group problem-solving situations (Parsons and Fulgenzi, 1968; Parsons, Fulgenzi, and Edelburg, 1969; and Cohen and Foerst, 1968) to infer that the sensitizer functions with greater aggressiveness in resolving conflicts. However, there are considerations which make this inference rather impossible to establish. The most important consideration is that the nature of the interaction during this task was much less experimentally restricted than in the previous experimental tasks. Consequently, styles of interaction other than "aggressiveness" could possibly account for the findings, e.g. passive-aggressiveness, dominance-submission, etc. Again, the fact that the present investigation utilized natural groups rather than experimentally created groups introduces another factor of unassessed importance. Also, the difference in the experimental tasks themselves could be another source of unknown variance. However, regardless of these considerations which render the making of inferences to be untenable, there is an important conclusion to be derived from this finding that the sensitizer had his judgment endorsed significantly more often than did the repressor. Namely, the previously

uncontradicted conclusion that the repressor functions more aggressively in group interaction needs to be reexamined in natural groups with focus on the history of the group, the group composition, the nature of the task, and the kind of experimental observation and data collected. By the same token it should also be stressed that the marital dyad needs to be studied under a variety of laboratory conditions relative to aggressive behavior and problem-solving behavior.

The next two hypotheses (Hypothesis 6 and 7) dealt with data that were achieved in much the same fashion as in previous investigations of R-S and aggressiveness. That is, self-ratings for aggressiveness and ratings-of-spouse for aggressiveness were requested from both marital partners in response to Bales' statements. It was found in Hypothesis (6) that for the repressor there were essentially congruent evaluations between his self-rating of aggressiveness and the rating of him by his partner. However, for the sensitizer there was a significant over-estimation of his self-rating for aggressiveness as compared to his partner's rating of him. The latter of these two findings is comparable to previous results (Parsons and Fulgenzi, 1968; and Parsons, Fulgenzi, and Edelburg, 1969) where sensitizers overestimated their aggressiveness. However, the former finding, where repressors were not rated by others as more aggressive than sensitizers, differs from the findings of these studies. One possible explanation of this difference might be the

consideration that the marital relationship could represent an intervening factor that relates to differential aggressiveness on the part of the repressor. The finding by Carrera and Cohen (1968) that extreme sensitizers manifest significantly greater verbal hostility subsequent to a failure experience might point to the need for the repressor to accomodate himself to the verbal aggressiveness of the sensitizer by reducing his own aggressiveness. Also, the finding by Joy (1963) that repressors were more concerned for maintaining harmonious group relations would seem to support the idea that the repressor would place priority on such accomodation, especially in his marriage. However, the finding that the repressor is not rated as more aggressive than the sensitizer in the context of the marital relationship remains discrepant from previous investigations.

Hypothesis (7) revealed that the sensitizer rates himself to be significantly more aggressive than the repressor rates himself to be. Thus, not only does the sensitizer rate himself to be more aggressive than he is rated to be by his mate, but also that the level at which he rates himself is significantly greater than the level at which the repressor rates himself to be. This finding occurs in dyad relationships where there are no significant differences in how any of the subjects, regardless of their R-S rating, are rated by their mate.

This finding of the sensitizer's exaggerated self-perception of aggressiveness seems consonant with the

findings by Altrocchi et al. (1960) and Byrne et al. (1963), where the sensitizer showed a significantly lower self-concept, and with the findings by Byrne and Griffitt (1969) where the sensitizer showed a significantly greater verbalization of "unpleasant descriptions of their internal state"

These findings add support to the argument that in many situations the sensitizer functions with introjected feelings of a hostile or negative nature.

The final data (Hypothesis 8) reveal the repressor to be more congruently perceived by his mate in regard to their evaluation of the stressful or satisfactory nature of aspects of their daily environment. These findings are opposite to the previously cited relevant study (Turk, 1963) which found the sensitizer to have his feelings more accurately perceived. It might be speculated that the present finding could relate to the fact that this study utilized naturally found, long-term, groups dealing with life-like tasks, while the majority of cited studies utilized experimentally created, short-term groups that dealt with human relations problems or common symbol tasks. Again it appears crucial that further studies need to be addressed to the issue of the generalizability of findings from such experimental groups to natural groups.

It might be interpreted from the present finding that the repressor, who is more congruently perceived regardless of the R-S rating of his partner, functions in a more open manner, while the sensitizer functions in a more closed

manner, vis-a-vis expressing positive and negative feelings. However, examination of the separated "Agreement scores" for each of the "Generally stressful" and "Generally satisfactory" categories (Appendix F, Tables 5 and 6) reveals that it is only with the "Generally satisfactory" items that there is a significant difference in congruency scores. It can be seen by these scores that the sensitizer is less well perceived in regard to his communication of "positive" feelings. Perhaps the sensitizer has special difficulty in the expression of positive feelings, in addition to the previously established fact that he also indicates significantly fewer "positive" feelings in the first place.

The findings in the present investigation show that the repressor exhibits a more successful level of marital adjustment, a lower level of perceived environmental stress, less aggressiveness in marital conflict resolution, a lower level of self-perceived aggressiveness, and a higher level of congruence between his self-evaluation and his spouse's evaluation of him. These findings consistently support a linear relationship between R-S and all dependent variables. It has also been argued that aspects of these data support the notion that more than just a "response bias" explanation is necessary to characterize the differential ratings made by repressors and sensitizers.

These findings appear to be complementary to other cited findings that reveal the repressor to be more concerned with

maintaining group relationships, to have a more positive self-image, and to solve problems better in group situations. On the other hand the sensitizer was found to be more anxious, more troubled by conflicting interpersonal needs, marked by more finely differentiated interpersonal cognition, etc. These differentiating features characterize the sensitizer as a person more attuned to evaluative judgments, particularly in the area of interpersonal relationships. It might further be posited that this "sensitization" can interfere in the accomplishment of various personal and interpersonal goals because of the sensitizer's over-concern with the quality of interpersonal relationships.

In this investigation the R-S concept was shown to have evolved from definition by a psychophysical criterion to the present psychometric criterion. This latter means of measuring R-S has been shown to reveal linear relationships rather than the theoretically predicted curvilinear relationships with various dependent factors. This empirically based rejection of the curvilinearity assumption would also seem to reject the conception of R-S in principally "defense mechanism" terms. Further, the findings from the present investigation, along with previous studies, would seem to support the conception of R-S in terms of both cognition and affection. That is, a theory more along the lines of the original "new look" studies, that included emphasis on both the relative sensitization (cognition) and the relative

evaluative orientation (affection) would seem to better elucidate the R-S construct. The data from the present study would support such an understanding. It would thus seem that a conception of R-S as a generalized differential reactivity to features of one's personal and interpersonal environment would be appropriate to fit the data. The present data and the previously cited research indicate that some of the areas of differential reactivity would include reaction to stress, to failure, to problem-solving in a group, and to interpersonal conflict.

A comment should be made regarding the conclusion by Carrera and Cohen (1968) that R-S appears to be a variable of relatively minor importance in small group interaction. The many significant findings in the present investigation certainly should establish the potential value of the R-S construct in examining process and outcome factors in natural groups. Perhaps the possibly premature rejection of the R-S construct is related to the previously described differences in investigative approach. This latter consideration should further establish the desirability of studying the relationship between personality variables and interpersonal processes within the context of natural groups, especially that of the marriage relationship.

Finally, consideration should be directed to the possible implications for marital counseling that may be derived from the present research. If future investigations find comparable

relationships between R-S and measures of marital satisfaction and adjustment, efforts would then need to be directed to the issue of whether high R-S ratings lead to marital maladjustment, or whether maladjustment leads to high R-S ratings. While R-S could in either case be useful as an index of current functioning, it could also serve as a predictive indicator if it related to increasing marital distress. Therapeutic strategies might then be developed in the areas of personal and interpersonal functioning which have already been described as ones of apparent difficulty for persons with high R-S ratings, e.g. self-attitudes, expressing feelings, and conflict situations.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

HEALTH AND OPINION SURVEY (INSTRUCTIONS)



Date _____
Marriage and College Life Project

Code # _____

This inventory consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is true as applied to you or false as applied to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed T. (See A at the right). If a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE, as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed F. (See B at the right). If a statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you don't know about, make no mark on the answer sheet.

Section of answer
sheet correctly
marked

	T	F
A		
B		

Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself. Do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks on this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND GO AHEAD.

(HOS Statements)

1. I have a good appetite.
2. I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
3. I am easily awakened by noise.
4. I like to read newspaper articles on crime.
5. My hands and feet are usually warm enough.
6. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.
7. I am about as able to work as I ever was.
8. There seems to be a lump in my throat much of the time.
9. I enjoy detective or mystery stories.
10. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
11. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.
12. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.
13. I am troubled by attacks of nausea and vomiting.
14. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I'm in trouble.
15. At times I feel like swearing.
16. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
17. I seldom worry about my health.
18. At times I feel like smashing things.
19. I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't "get going."
20. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.
21. Much of the time my head seems to hurt all over.
22. I do not always tell the truth.
23. My judgment is better than it ever was.

24. Once a week or oftener I feel suddenly hot all over, without apparent cause.
25. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.
26. I prefer to pass by school friends, or people I know but have not seen for a long time, unless they speak to me first.
27. I am almost never bothered by pains over the heart or in my chest.
28. I am a good mixer.
29. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.
30. I do not read every editorial in the newspaper every day.
31. I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose their patience with me.
32. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
33. I think a great many people exaggerate their misfortunes in order to gain the sympathy and help of others.
34. I get angry sometimes.
35. Most of the time I feel blue.
36. I sometimes tease animals.
37. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
38. I usually feel that life is worthwhile.
39. It takes a lot of argument to convince most people of the truth.
40. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
41. I think most people would lie to get ahead.
42. I do many things I regret afterwards. (I regret things more or more often than others seem to.)
43. I go to church almost every week.
44. I have very few quarrels with members of my family.

45. I believe in the second coming of Christ.
46. My hardest battles are with myself.
47. I have little or no trouble with my muscles twitching or jumping.
48. I don't seem to care what happens to me.
49. Sometimes when I am not feeling well I am cross.
50. Much of the time I feel as if I have done something wrong or evil.
51. I am happy most of the time.
52. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.
53. Often I feel as if there were a tight band about my head.
54. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
55. I seem to be about as capable and smart as most others around me.
56. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it.
57. The sight of blood neither frightens me nor makes me sick.
58. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
59. I have never vomited blood or coughed up blood.
60. I do not worry about catching diseases.
61. At times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.
62. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
63. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.
64. I believe that my home life is as pleasant as that of most people I know.

65. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.
66. My conduct is largely controlled by the customs of those about me.
67. I certainly feel useless at times.
68. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
69. I have often lost out on things because I couldn't make up my mind soon enough.
70. It makes me impatient to have people ask my advice or otherwise interrupt me when I am working on something important.
71. I would rather win than lose in a game.
72. Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.
73. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.
74. I have never had a fit or convulsion.
75. I am neither gaining nor losing weight.
76. I cry easily.
77. I cannot understand what I read as well as I used to.
78. I have never felt better in my life than I do now.
79. I resent having anyone take me in so cleverly that I have had to admit that it was one on me.
80. I do not tire quickly.
81. I like to study and read about things that I am working at.
82. I like to know some important people because it makes me feel important.
83. What others think of me does not bother me.
84. It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of things.
85. I frequently have to fight against showing that I am bashful.

86. I have never had a fainting spell.
87. I seldom or never have dizzy spells.
88. My memory seems to be all right.
89. I am worried about sex matters.
90. I find it hard to make talk when I meet new people.
91. I am afraid of losing my mind.
92. I am against giving money to beggars.
93. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
94. I can read a long while without tiring my eyes.
95. I feel weak all over much of the time.
96. I have very few headaches.
97. Sometimes, when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly.
98. I have had no difficulty in keeping my balance in walking.
99. I do not have spells of hay fever or asthma.
100. I do not like everyone I know.
101. I wish I were not so shy.
102. I enjoy many different kinds of play and recreation.
103. I like to flirt.
104. In walking I am very careful to step over sidewalk cracks.
105. I frequently find myself worrying about something.
106. I gossip a little at times.
107. I hardly ever notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath.
108. I have at times stood in the way of people who were trying to do something, not because it amounted to much but because of the principle of the thing.

109. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.
110. I brood a great deal.
111. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
112. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
113. I believe I am no more nervous than most others.
114. I have few or no pains.
115. Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
116. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
117. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
118. I have difficulty in starting to do things.
119. I sweat very easily even on cool days.
120. It is safer to trust nobody.
121. Once a week or oftener I become very excited.
122. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
123. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.
124. I do not blame a person for taking advantage of someone who lays himself open to it.
125. At times I am all full of energy.
126. My eyesight is as good as it has been for years.
127. I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
128. I drink an unusually large amount of water every day.
129. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.
130. I am always disgusted with the law when a criminal is freed through the arguments of a smart lawyer.

131. I work under a great deal of tension.
132. I am likely not to speak to people until they speak to me.
133. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
134. Life is a strain for me much of the time.
135. In school I find it very hard to talk before the class.
136. Even when I am with people I feel lonely much of the time.
137. I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
138. I am easily embarrassed.
139. I worry over money and business.
140. I almost never dream.
141. I easily become impatient with people.
142. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.
143. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
144. I forget right away what people say to me.
145. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.
146. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see.
147. I often feel as if things were not real.
148. I have a habit of counting things that are not important such as bulbs on electric signs, and so forth.
149. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.
150. I get anxious and upset when I have to make a short trip away from home.
151. I have been afraid of things or people that I knew could not hurt me.

152. I have no dread of going into a room by myself where other people have already gathered and are talking.
153. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.
154. I have several times given up doing a thing because I thought too little of my ability.
155. Bad words, often terrible words, come into my mind and I cannot get rid of them.
156. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.
157. Almost every day something happens to frighten me.
158. I am inclined to take things hard.
159. I am more sensitive than most other people.
160. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
161. I very seldom have spells of the blues.
162. I wish I could get over worrying about things I have said that may have injured other people's feelings.
163. People often disappoint me.
164. I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself.
165. My plans have frequently seemed so full of difficulties that I have had to give them up.
166. Often, even though everything is going fine for me, I feel that I don't care about anything.
167. I have sometimes felt that difficulties were piling up so high that I could not overcome them.
168. I often think, "I wish I were a child again."
169. I have often met people who were supposed to be experts who were no better than I.
170. It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of the success of someone I know well.
171. I am apt to take disappointments so keenly that I can't put them out of my mind.

172. At times I think I am no good at all.
173. I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes.
174. I am apt to pass up something I want to do because others feel that I am not going about it in the right way.
175. I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time.
176. I have several times had a change of heart about my life work.
177. I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
178. I like to let people know where I stand on things.
179. I have a daydream life about which I do not tell other people.
180. I have often felt guilty because I have pretended to feel more sorry about something than I really was.
181. I feel tired a good deal of the time.
182. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.

APPENDIX B

LOCKE-WALLACE SHORT MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

Circle the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage.

• • • • •

1.	Very Unhappy	Happy	Perfectly Happy
----	-----------------	-------	--------------------

On the following items state the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate. Please circle the appropriate number for your response.

Always	Almost	Occasionally	Frequently	Almost	Always
Agree	Always	Disagree	Disagree	Always	Disagree
	Agree			Disagree	

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

2. Handling family finances

3.	Matters of recreation				
1	2	3	4	5	6

4.	Demonstrations of affection					
1	2	3	4	5	6	

5.	Sex relations				
1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Friends

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

7. Conventional¹ity (right, good, or proper conduct)²
1 2 3 4 5 6

8.	Philosophy of life				
1	2	3	4	5	6

9. Ways of dealing with in-laws

1	2	3	4	5	6

10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in: husband giving in ____, wife giving in ____, agreement by mutual give and take ____.

11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together?
All of them _____. Some of them _____. Very few of them _____.
None of them _____.

12. In leisure time do you generally prefer: To be "on the go" _____. To stay at home ____? Does your mate generally prefer: To be "on the go" _____. To stay at home _____?
13. Do you ever wish you had not married?
Frequently ____ Occasionally ____ Rarely ____ Never ____
14. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: Marry the same person ____, Marry a different person ____, Not marry at all _____?
15. Do you confide in your mate?
Almost never ____ Rarely ____ In most things ____
In everything _____

APPENDIX C

MARRIAGE AND COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT INVENTORY¹ (INSTRUCTIONS)

Date _____
Marriage and College Life Project

Code # _____

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine those aspects of the college situation which are most commonly sources of stress or satisfaction to married college students. On the basis of the information gathered we hope to aid the married student. Reports will be presented to several different levels of university administration which will focus attention on ways the university may work more effectively toward improving the living, social, and academic conditions of married student life. Your answers will be added to those of 400 other couples. All of you have been specially selected so that the findings of this study will be representative and be of considerable importance. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

The items listed relate to aspects of your marriage or the college environment which are experienced as satisfying or as stressful. Consider each item and rate it according to what is generally true. If the aspect generally has been a source of satisfaction or gratification to you, rate it as generally satisfying. If the aspect generally has been a source of stress or dissatisfaction to you, rate it as generally stressful.

If you feel that the item has neither been particularly satisfying nor stressful, rate it in the appropriate category -- neither. PLEASE CONSIDER EACH ITEM CAREFULLY, and place in the "neither" category only those items which you feel have not affected you in a satisfying or stressful sense.

¹The MACE has both a Husband and a Wife form that include a few statements that require an appropriate differentiation based upon the sex of the responder. The following statements are those comprising the Wife form.

Rate as non-applicable those items which have not been part of your life experience. Example: If you have no children, items such as, "Amount of time spent with children," should be rated "non-applicable." However, other items such as, "Amount of encouragement you receive from your husband," should not be rated as "non-applicable." If you receive no encouragement from your husband, consider whether this lack of encouragement has been "generally stressful," "generally satisfying," or has had "neither" effect upon you.

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable	Generally	Generally	
(1)	Satisfying	Stressful	Neither
	(2)	(3)	(4)

EXAMPLE:

(06) 1 2 3 4 Amount of encouragement you receive from your husband

If you find that this is generally a source of satisfaction to you, you should circle the number 2. The first two digits (06) are for purposes of identification and should be ignored by you.

(MACE Statements)

Please consider each item carefully and circle the appropriate number:

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)	Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
06	1 2 3 4	Associating with other married students	
07	1 2 3 4	Monthly earnings relative to cost of living	
08	1 2 3 4	Husband's having friends over frequently	
09	1 2 3 4	Extent to which we share free time	
10	1 2 3 4	Financial expenses related to children	
11	1 2 3 4	Working while going to school	
12	1 2 3 4	Availability of student financial assistance	
13	1 2 3 4	Amount of time your husband has available for family after studying	
14	1 2 3 4	Amount of time you have available for family after studying	
15	1 2 3 4	Amount of time you take for personal recreation	
16	1 2 3 4	Physical fatigue	
17	1 2 3 4	Your performance of household tasks	
18	1 2 3 4	Extent of husband's assistance with household tasks	
19	1 2 3 4	Your qualifications for getting good employment	
20	1 2 3 4	Being in the "mate-market" atmosphere of the university	
21	1 2 3 4	Being with people your own age	
22	1 2 3 4	Living in the intellectual and cultural atmosphere of the university	
23	1 2 3 4	Learning to budget and manage finances	
24	1 2 3 4	Attitude of university toward married students and families	
25	1 2 3 4	Amount of time you spend on household chores	
26	1 2 3 4	Compatibility of schedules	
27	1 2 3 4	Having savings to fall back on	
28	1 2 3 4	Husband's arrangements with the draft board	
29	1 2 3 4	Borrowing money	
30	1 2 3 4	Membership in off-campus organizations	

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)					Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
31	1	2	3	4	Membership in on-campus organizations		
32	1	2	3	4	Adjusting to a lower income level		
33	1	2	3	4	Adjusting to social life and activities of the university		
34	1	2	3	4	Attitude of university toward educational interests of wives		
35	1	2	3	4	Your not being able to complete your education		
36	1	2	3	4	Degree to which you are pursuing your personal interests		
37	1	2	3	4	Buying on credit		
38	1	2	3	4	Your working full or part-time		
39	1	2	3	4	Attending cultural events with your husband		
40	1	2	3	4	Your social involvement with your husband's department		
41	1	2	3	4	Your social involvement with your department		
42	1	2	3	4	Varied schedules from quarter to quarter		
43	1	2	3	4	Other's caring for your children while you work or study		
44	1	2	3	4	Wide range of attitudes, values, and beliefs on campus		
45	1	2	3	4	Requirements of your husband's particular study program		
46	1	2	3	4	Requirements of your particular study program		
47	1	2	3	4	Your husband's relationship to faculty		
48	1	2	3	4	Your relationship to faculty		
49	1	2	3	4	Your husband's studying at home		
50	1	2	3	4	Your studying at home		
51	1	2	3	4	Impersonal nature of the university		
52	1	2	3	4	Competition within classes		
53	1	2	3	4	Your husband's grades		
54	1	2	3	4	Your grades		
55	1	2	3	4	Your husband's study habits		
56	1	2	3	4	Your study habits		
57	1	2	3	4	Studying with children present		
58	1	2	3	4	Preparation for quals or comprehensives		
59	1	2	3	4	Work on thesis or dissertation		
60	1	2	3	4	Effects of mobile situation on children		

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)	Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)	
61	1 2 3 4			Added responsibilities because of children
62	1 2 3 4			Financial assistance from parents
63	1 2 3 4			Your husband's ability to keep pace socially with you
64	1 2 3 4			Extent to which you keep pace intellectually with husband
65	1 2 3 4			Inability to communicate with husband because of terminology or technical nature of his work
66	1 2 3 4			Seeing the end in sight
67	1 2 3 4			Helping friends with their problems
68	1 2 3 4			Assisting with your husband's projects
69	1 2 3 4			Neighbor's reaction to your having or not having children
70	1 2 3 4			Your husband's level of confidence in his ability to be a success in his chosen field
71	1 2 3 4			Husband's level of interest in your major or field of work
72	1 2 3 4			Your present financial status
73	1 2 3 4			Husband's not adhering to his usual schedule
74	1 2 3 4			Degree of appreciation husband shows for your hard work
75	1 2 3 4			Husband's (optimistic/pessimistic) general out- look on life
76	1 2 3 4			Amount of time you arrange for love-making
77	1 2 3 4			Financial independence from parents
78	1 2 3 4			Adjusting to a new community
79	1 2 3 4			Manner in which you take care of the children
80	1 2 3 4			Extent to which husband shares responsibilities for the children
06	1 2 3 4			Amount of companionship with your husband
07	1 2 3 4			Both making sacrifices to complete educational goals
08	1 2 3 4			Initial adjustment to being a student wife
09	1 2 3 4			Being around single students who have less family responsibility
10	1 2 3 4			Your being the major or sole support of the family

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)					Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
11	1	2	3	4	Extent to which your husband needs you		
12	1	2	3	4	Amount of encouragement you receive from your husband		
13	1	2	3	4	The prospect of future financial security		
14	1	2	3	4	Postponing things you both want to do		
15	1	2	3	4	Sharing responsibilities which are usually the husband's		
16	1	2	3	4	Availability of student housing		
17	1	2	3	4	Help you received finding housing		
18	1	2	3	4	Friendliness and helpfulness of non-university people		
19	1	2	3	4	Schools for your children		
20	1	2	3	4	Anticipation of how you will fill your role in relation to your husband's profession		
21	1	2	3	4	Living in a student village		
22	1	2	3	4	Living off-campus		
23	1	2	3	4	Amount of orientation university gives to married students		
24	1	2	3	4	University-provided medical services for you and family		
25	1	2	3	4	Community-provided medical services for you and family		
26	1	2	3	4	Availability of employment for you		
27	1	2	3	4	Unanticipated expenses of a new environment		
28	1	2	3	4	Availability of employment for your husband		
29	1	2	3	4	Availability of cultural activities in this city		
30	1	2	3	4	Availability of bargain centers and discount stores		
31	1	2	3	4	Amount of knowledge concerning this community before coming		
32	1	2	3	4	Available recreation outside of university atmosphere		
33	1	2	3	4	Finding babysitters		
34	1	2	3	4	Privacy from neighbors		
35	1	2	3	4	Cost of living in this city		

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)	Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
36	1 2 3 4	Playground facilities for children	
37	1 2 3 4	Day-care centers	
38	1 2 3 4	Knowing that your stay here is temporary	
39	1 2 3 4	Availability of playmates for your children	
40	1 2 3 4	Adjusting during the first months of marriage	
41	1 2 3 4	Husband's views on money matters, and his spending habits	
42	1 2 3 4	Husband's interests and hobbies	
43	1 2 3 4	Emotional ties with parents	
44	1 2 3 4	Maturity of husband in accepting responsibility and handling problems	
45	1 2 3 4	Your sex life	
46	1 2 3 4	Amount of attention husband gives to the children	
47	1 2 3 4	Amount of attention husband gives to you	
48	1 2 3 4	Living far away from parents	
49	1 2 3 4	Husband's remembrance of sentimental occasions	
50	1 2 3 4	Husband's comments on your personal appearance	
51	1 2 3 4	Relationship with your in-laws	
52	1 2 3 4	Husband's ability to work out differences openly	
53	1 2 3 4	Amount of affection shown to you by husband	
54	1 2 3 4	Your understanding of how men think, react, etc.	
55	1 2 3 4	Way in which husband accepts your shortcomings, failures, etc.	
56	1 2 3 4	Amount of knowledge of sex at time of marriage	
57	1 2 3 4	Combining adjusting to marriage with going to school	
58	1 2 3 4	Husband's display of moods and emotions	
59	1 2 3 4	Ability to discuss and communicate with each other	
60	1 2 3 4	Openness in discussion of sex interests and concerns	
61	1 2 3 4	Husband's habits and idiosyncracies	
62	1 2 3 4	Working together on house repair, furnishing, etc.	
63	1 2 3 4	Husband's possessive nature	
64	1 2 3 4	Way in which problems and arguments are handled in your marriage	
65	1 2 3 4	Your husband's health	

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)	Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
66	1 2 3 4		Marrying at the time you did
67	1 2 3 4		Differing family backgrounds
68	1 2 3 4		Learning on your own to be effective in marriage
69	1 2 3 4		Your husband's expectations of you as a wife
70	1 2 3 4		Parental attitudes toward your getting married
71	1 2 3 4		Husband's comparing you to other women
72	1 2 3 4		How your expectations for marriage have worked out
73	1 2 3 4		Mutual interests and activities
74	1 2 3 4		Husband's asserting his individuality
75	1 2 3 4		Husband's views on education
76	1 2 3 4		Husband's idea of what your social activities should be
77	1 2 3 4		Having close friends in common
78	1 2 3 4		Manner in which you make decisions together
79	1 2 3 4		Husband's religious beliefs and practices
80	1 2 3 4		Husband's ability as a "handyman"
06	1 2 3 4		Flexibility of husband to change, to accept new ideas
07	1 2 3 4		Husband's need for material goods
08	1 2 3 4		Competition with husband in sports, intellectual activities, etc.
09	1 2 3 4		Husband's political viewpoints
10	1 2 3 4		Strong personality of husband
11	1 2 3 4		Husband's occupational goals
12	1 2 3 4		Effect of your religious beliefs
13	1 2 3 4		Husband's maintaining neat appearance
14	1 2 3 4		Being (or the thought of being) a mother
15	1 2 3 4		How decision was made regarding method of contraception
16	1 2 3 4		Your present status of having (or not having) children
17	1 2 3 4		Attitude of husband concerning family planning
18	1 2 3 4		Possibility of an unplanned pregnancy
19	1 2 3 4		The contraceptive being used
20	1 2 3 4		First unplanned pregnancy

RESPONSE SCALE

Non-applicable (1)	Generally Satisfying (2)	Generally Stressful (3)	Neither (4)
21	1 2 3 4	Second or third unplanned pregnancy	
22	1 2 3 4	Side effects of contraceptive method	
23	1 2 3 4	Religious considerations in planning a family	
24	1 2 3 4	Anticipation of your becoming pregnant	
25	1 2 3 4	Spacing of children	
26	1 2 3 4	Learning on your own how to be a parent	
27	1 2 3 4	The first weeks with your new baby	
28	1 2 3 4	Extent to which your husband shares in the care of the baby	
29	1 2 3 4	Amount of knowledge of what to expect of children	
30	1 2 3 4	Extent to which parenthood has had a maturing effect upon you	

APPENDIX D

BALES' RATING SCALES

(SPOUSE-RATING INSTRUCTIONS)

The next task is for you to rate your partner on several behavior categories regarding how he usually acts in interpersonal situations of problem-solving and conflict. Using your experience in the previous task as an example of such situations I would like you to rate your spouse on each of the items contained on the next page. Be as accurate as possible and make sure that you answer every item even if it is necessary to guess. These items are to be rated on a five-point scale. That is, a rating of 1 would indicate that particular behavior was "not displayed at all." A rating of 5 would indicate that behavior was "very strongly displayed." Read each item carefully and decide how strongly, if at all, that particular behavior is displayed by your partner in situations of conflict. Then write the appropriate number beside that category.

(SELF-RATING INSTRUCTIONS)

Now, I would like you to rate yourself on the same categories that you just used to rate your spouse. Think of your behavior in such situations of problem-solving and conflict while using tonight's experience as an example of such situations. Again, read each item carefully and decide how strongly, if at all, that particular behavior is displayed by you in situations of conflict. Then write the appropriate number beside that category.

(BALES Statements)

Not Displayed <u>at all</u>	Slightly Displayed	Moderately Displayed	Strongly Displayed	Very Strongly Displayed
-----------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------------

1

2

3

4

5

Beside each category, place the number you feel is most appropriate.

- _____ 1. Shows tension release by joking, laughing, clowning, or "kidding." Includes remarks made to smooth over some tension.
- _____ 2. Shows passive acceptance, is modest, humble, unassertive, retiring, and contributes little.
- _____ 3. Shows active concern to arrive at solutions or decisions and to adopt a plan of action or resolution.
- _____ 4. Attempts to control, regulate, govern, direct, or supervise in a manner in which freedom of choice or consent for the other person is greatly limited or nonexistent.
- _____ 5. Shows stubborn and resistive behavior. Is non-compliant, unwilling, or disobliging, and resists efforts or imagined efforts of someone to take some satisfaction from him.
- _____ 6. Attempts to deflate others' status by overriding their conversation, interrupting, belittling, ridiculing, and making fun of them.
- _____ 7. Attempts to excite, amaze, fascinate, entertain, shock, intrigue, or amuse others as a means of raising his own status.
- _____ 8. Shows emotional reactions such as being cranky, uncongenial, touchy, irritable, and ill-tempered. Is aggressive, combative, belligerent, quarrelsome, or argumentative.

INVENTORY OF MARITAL CONFLICTS¹
CASE DESCRIPTIONS

1. (Same) Bob and Frank are good friends. Janis, Bob's wife, likes Frank but is becoming increasingly annoyed with his unannounced and excessively long visits to their apartment, usually at mealtimes. She has suggested to Bob that he ask Frank to please phone before visiting, but her husband feels this would be insulting to his friend. Janis suggests that she might ask Frank to please phone before visiting, but this only makes her husband angry. After accusing his wife of interfering with his friendship, he refuses to discuss the matter further.
2. (Same) Cora doesn't really enjoy sexual relations. When she was first married she would avoid love making by telling her husband it was painful. More recently she has pretended to be tired when her husband has approached her. Now she has resorted to retiring earlier than her husband. Cora believes sex is an unpleasant subject that one does not discuss unless absolutely necessary, and she becomes furious when Jack insists they should talk about this problem.
3. (Wife) When Don finally arrives home from work he immediately sits down and makes himself comfortable with a can of beer and scatters his jacket, tie and shoes on the furniture and/or floor, where they stay until some time after dinner. After putting up with this sloppiness for a while, Francine asks Don to stop tossing his clothes around the apartment, even if he does eventually pick them up. Two days later, Don repeats his usual performance as if Francine had said nothing. When she mentions it again, an argument develops.

¹The IMC has separate husband and wife forms for their initial judgments. The vignettes that have different versions for a given situation have both forms represented in this appendix.

3. (Husband) When Don finally gets home from work he takes off his jacket, tie and shoes, and makes himself comfortable with a can of beer. After dinner Don has a little more energy, so he goes back and puts away the various articles of clothing he has taken off. One day Francine tells Don he is sloppy and lazy and demands that he not leave clothes lying around, even for a short period of time. Two days later, Don forgets to do as his wife had demanded, and she angrily repeats her complaint. An argument develops.
4. (Wife) Nina has been shopping around carefully for some time to find a pair of shoes she can afford that will go with her favorite dress. She finally finds a satisfactory pair of shoes and is happy to discover that they are on sale. She purchases the shoes and takes them home to show her husband, Peter. He does not care whether or not the shoes are satisfactory. He doubts that they are necessary at all and fails to understand their importance to her or how much trouble she has gone to in order to save money.
4. (Husband) Nina has been looking for a pair of shoes to wear with her favorite dress. Upon finding a pair of shoes on sale, Nina just cannot resist and purchases them. Later that evening she shows her new purchase to Peter. He remembers that she already has many pairs of shoes and asks about the necessity of such a purchase at this time. Nina becomes outraged and accuses him of being cheap and inconsiderate.
5. (Same) Mark and Elaine have both been working since their marriage in order to live at a level which they feel to be comfortable. Occasionally, Elaine becomes depressed because she wants to have a child but knows that on Mark's salary alone this would be extremely difficult. Elaine's emotions get the best of her, and she accuses Mark of not being aggressive enough, implying that he is an inadequate provider. Mark was advised not to go to college because of scholastic difficulties and has done as well as could reasonably be expected, but his wife continually compares him unfavorably to his college-educated friends. Mark's self esteem is injured and an argument begins.
6. (Wife) A conflict has arisen between Jack and Colleen following a party with friends. During the party, Jack becomes involved with another woman and ignores his wife. Colleen feels hurt and attempts to discuss her feelings of being neglected but feels like she is not understood.

6. (Husband) A conflict has arisen between Jack and Colleen following a party with friends. During the party, Jack talked to another woman, resulting in his wife becoming very angry. Following the party, Colleen angrily accuses Jack of intentionally ignoring her for the entire evening and becomes argumentative.
7. (Wife) Betty and Phil have been having marital difficulties for the past year. Betty is no longer reassured by having her husband minimize her unhappiness and wants to seek professional counseling. Phil, on the other hand, insists on holding off indefinitely before spending money on counseling. He says she is far too extravagant. In the weeks to come, many arguments arise because of their differing opinions.
7. (Husband) Betty and Phil have been having marital difficulties for the past year. One of the problems has been Betty's extravagance. Now Betty insists on immediately seeking costly professional counseling. Phil points out that there simply is no money to pay for such an expensive venture until they can cut down their expenses some place else. Betty will not hear of waiting until money is available, and many arguments arise in the weeks to come.
8. (Same) Jim routinely arrives home from work at 5:00 PM and enjoys his dinner soon after his arrival. Susan has been a full-time housewife since the birth of their first child one year ago but still leaves her domestic chores undone. Jim has asked Susan if she would have the house clean and dinner prepared when he returns home. Upon arriving home, Jim again finds the ironing board with a pile of clothes in the living room, a dining table that has not been set, and his wife sitting on the sofa reading a magazine. Upon viewing the situation Jim appears discouraged, whereupon Susan accuses him of always finding fault with her and angrily storms into the kitchen.
9. (Wife) It's Friday evening, and the Carter family has a dinner engagement, which had been made the previous week. Frank surprises his wife by getting home from work a half hour early and uses the bathroom continuously until it is almost time to leave. Since it takes Mary more than the few minutes Frank has left her to wash, comb her hair, and put on her makeup, it becomes obvious that they will be late for their appointment. Frank raises his voice and accuses her of always making them late. Mary tries to calm Frank down by saying that being a little late is not all that serious, but Frank just becomes more enraged and an argument develops.

9. (Husband) It's Friday evening and the Carter family have a dinner engagement, which had been made the previous week. Frank comes home a half hour early so he can be sure to be ready on time. He showers, shaves and is dressed and ready to leave on time. But when it is time to go, Mary is still in the bathroom combing her hair and putting on makeup. Since Mary almost always makes them late this way, Frank becomes upset. Mary retorts that she isn't very concerned about being late since they always get where they are going sooner or later.
10. (Wife) Linda and Steve plan to take a weekend trip by car. While Linda is driving Steve to work on Friday morning, Steve decides that the spark plugs need changing and that other minor adjustments should be made. He tells his wife to get the work done in time for them to leave that evening. Linda also has all the other preparations to manage for them and their two children but she manages to get the car to the garage and asks for a tuneup. On the trip, Steve hears a "pinging" noise, discovers that the spark plugs are the same ones he had been using, and blames his wife for the spark plugs not being changed. Linda feels that if he is going to be so picky about how things are going to be done, he should assume some responsibility for doing them himself. Steve tells her he was too busy.
10. (Husband) Linda and Steve plan to take a weekend trip by car. While Linda is driving Steve to work on Friday morning, Steve hears a "pinging" noise and realizes that the spark plugs should be changed along with other minor adjustments. Since they plan to leave Friday evening and Steve has to work, he has to ask his wife to take the car to the garage. Linda complains about the other preparations she says she has to make for them and their two children but says she will have time to take the car to the garage, and agrees to do so. Later on the trip, Steve hears the "pinging" noise and realizes the spark plugs have not been changed. It turns out that Linda took the car to the garage but did not bother to mention the spark plugs. Linda says that if Steve doesn't like the way she does things he can do them himself. Steve points out that he was unable to take the car to the garage and that when she agrees to do something she should do it.
11. (Wife) When Charlotte and Richard were living with Charlotte's family, a lot of ill will developed between Richard and his in-laws. Richard told his wife to stop talking so much with members of her family. When Charlotte's mother found out how Richard felt, she was

hurt and said she thought Richard was out of place to make such a demand. Richard and Charlotte now have their own home but the situation continues. Richard will rarely visit his in-laws, so Charlotte's only regular contact with them is by phone. Charlotte usually speaks only to her mother and only phones her mother when her husband is not around, but Richard is still not satisfied. Richard insists that Charlotte stop speaking with her mother.

11. (Husband) When Charlotte and Richard were living with Charlotte's family, a lot of ill will developed between Richard and his in-laws. Charlotte told her parents just about everything that happened, and when Richard told her to stop, his mother-in-law said she was hurt and told Charlotte to keep Richard in his place. Richard and Charlotte now have their own home, but the situation continues. Richard will rarely visit his in-laws, but whenever he is not around Charlotte is on the phone with her mother, passing on information and receiving advice. When Richard tells Charlotte again that she should stop telling things to her mother, Charlotte becomes enraged.
12. (Same) Each night Larry promises Judy that he will throw the garbage out after they finish dinner. Invariably, Larry forgets and leaves the kitchen without doing what he has promised. Judy has felt that the best thing to do is to throw the garbage away by herself and has been doing this later in the evening. When he notices this, Larry becomes angry with Judy, stating that this is his job. As Larry continues to follow his old habits, Judy begins to do the chore herself, only to be angrily criticized by her husband.
13. (Wife) At parties Nancy prefers the company of men to the other women and spends much of the evening with them because she finds them intellectually stimulating and shares many of their interest. Nancy finds at parties that the women's conversations are limited to house-keeping, children, etc. Nancy is upset by Bob's accusations that her behavior may lead to involvement in an affair or, at the very least, misinterpretation of her behavior by other people, which would cause gossip. She is deeply hurt by his lack of trust since she is a devoted wife and would not consider an involvement with another man.
13. (Husband) At parties that Bob and Nancy attend, Nancy spends most of her time with the men present and obviously enjoys being with them. Bob is very concerned and has tried to tell Nancy that her behavior is interpreted as flirtatious and could lead to a romantic involvement with another man. Nancy denies this, but Bob knows

from his own experience that this type of thing does frequently happen and feels that she is being inconsiderate of his feelings by not giving up this behavior.

14. (Wife) Jerry regularly comes home from work, eats, and sits down in front of the television screen for the entire evening. Betty is cooped up in the house all day and feels that she will go crazy if she can't get out and have some sort of contact with other human beings. Jerry refuses to go out and so there is a disagreement between Betty and Jerry.

14. (Husband) When Jerry comes home from work in the evening he is tired and likes to relax over a pleasant meal. After dinner he prefers to be alone with his wife. However, Betty does not understand Jerry's unwillingness to go out after a hard day's work, and she is after him to go out partying in the evenings. She tells Jerry he is a lazy do-nothing.

15. (Wife) Dick and Diane have been married for three years. Dick likes his job and is anxious to get ahead. For the past year he has been voluntarily spending a great deal of time at his work. Diane feels that their marital relationship is deteriorating due to the lack of time they are able to spend together. She attempts to explain to Dick that financial success will be meaningless if their marriage is destroyed in the process. Dick coolly tells his wife that her response is so immature that it is pointless to discuss the subject further.

15. (Husband) Dick and Diane have been married for three years. Dick likes his job and is anxious to get ahead. For the past year he has been voluntarily spending a great deal of extra time at his work. Diane has repeatedly accused Dick of caring more about his job than he cares for her. Dick explains that his career is important to both of them and that it is necessary for him to work additional hours if he expects to get promoted. Diane refuses to listen to Dick's explanations and unreasonably demands that he substantially cut down his hours of over-time work.

16. (Wife) Tom claims to be worried about Betty's health because she smokes so much and has a cough. He gives her endless detailed lectures about health hazards and is always demanding that she stop or cut down. Betty realizes that she smokes too much and is trying to cut down, but Tom's continued badgering is no help. Tom apparently feels that because he stopped smoking without any difficulty, everybody else should quit too and should have no trouble doing so. He seems unable to understand

that it is difficult for her to change her smoking habits and he says that if she really loved him she would quit. Betty has tried to control herself and not get angry at Tom's continuous comments, but Tom goes right on lecturing to her and eventually there are a series of arguments.

16. (Husband) Tom is very concerned about his wife's smoking habits. Betty is a very heavy smoker and has a severe cough. Although Tom used to be a heavy smoker himself, he has now quit completely, so he is convinced that Betty could at least cut down. He has told her in detail about the health hazards involved in smoking and he has asked her to stop or at least cut down, if not for herself then because of her love for him. Betty's usual reaction has been to get sarcastic. She says she is trying but doesn't change. As a result there has been a series of arguments.
17. (Wife) Chuck is an ardent sport fan who spends every Sunday afternoon glued to the television screen watching football. His wife Betty is getting tired of being left by herself every Sunday, so she asks him to give up this part of his football watching and plans some Sunday activities for them together. Chuck not only refuses to give up any football, but he launches into a whole series of arguments to defend himself. He tells Betty that no one else's wife is as unreasonable as she is. He accuses her of spending her time watching soap operas while he is at work. He also tells her that since he works hard he should be able to watch football games if he wishes. Betty is upset by his attitude but continues to want him to spend Sunday with her.
17. (Husband) Chuck is a football fan who likes to watch the pro games on Sunday afternoons. His wife Betty is upset at this, so she plans a series of activities for them together on Sundays and tells him he will have to give up the football games. Chuck feels that this is an unreasonable demand. He points out that he works all week and should be entitled to a couple of hours of relaxation watching TV on Sunday. He reminds her that she watches many hours of soap operas during the week when he is at work. Chuck also reminds Betty that the other wives they know do not get so upset just because their husbands watch football. Betty, however, continues to be annoyed and insists that he stop watching games.
18. (Same) John has been out of college for three years and is able to provide a modest but adequate income for himself and his wife, Jean. They have been planning a vacation, which Jean has been enthusiastically anticipating.

John has always been a stereo enthusiast and presently feels that he wants to improve his stereo by buying new speakers. If John proceeds with his plan, the vacation they have planned would be impossible. John states that he is the breadwinner in the family and deserves a luxury. He insists that as the man in the family, he should make the decision.

(IMC INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT ANSWER SHEET)

Instructions:

It is very important that for EACH case you decide which spouse, either the husband or wife, is primarily responsible for the problem. You should make ONE response for both PART A and PART B. Do not leave any questions unanswered. Complete each case before going on to the next item.

Case	PART A		PART B
	Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Which of the following would be a better way to resolve the conflict?
	Check One		
	Hus-band	Wife	Check Only One
1. Conflict over frequent visits by husband's friend and wife's annoyance.			<input type="checkbox"/> Should Bob ask Frank to phone before visiting? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Janis stop interfering in her husband's friendship?
2. Conflict regarding satisfaction during sexual relations.			<input type="checkbox"/> Is Cora being reasonable in refusing to discuss the problem of sex? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Is Jack justified in suggesting they discuss the problem of sex?
3. Conflict concerning husband's distributing his shirt, tie, jacket and shoes around the apartment when he gets home from work.			<input type="checkbox"/> Should Don be able to relax this way before dinner? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Don be more considerate of Francine by not scattering his clothes around?
4. Conflict about wife's purchase of a pair of shoes to wear with new dress.			<input type="checkbox"/> Is it reasonable for Peter to question the necessity of Nina's purchase? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Peter try to understand Nina's well-planned purchase of these particular shoes?

Case	PART A		PART B
	Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Which of the following would be a better way to resolve the conflict?
	Check One		
	Hus-band	Wife	Check Only One
5. Conflict between Mark and Elaine stemming from their desire to have a child but recognizing the financial burden.			<div><div>—</div>Is Elaine justified in accusing Mark of being an inadequate provider? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Elaine be more understanding concerning Mark's ability and achievements?</div>
6. Conflict caused by wife feeling ignored by husband while at a party.			<div><div>—</div>Should Jack be permitted to talk to another woman at a party without Colleen becoming upset? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Jack be more attentive to his wife at parties?</div>
7. Conflict over when to seek professional help for the marital difficulties between Betty and Phil.			<div><div>—</div>Is Phil justified in worrying about starting counseling without being able to afford it? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Is Betty justified in feeling that their marriage is more important than any financial considerations?</div>
8. Conflict concerning wife's inability to have house clean and dinner ready upon husband's arrival.			<div><div>—</div>Should Susan be reading a magazine when her household duties are not completed and dinner is not prepared? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Susan try to be a better housekeeper?</div>
9. Conflict over wife's lateness for dinner engagement.			<div><div>—</div>Should Mary make a greater effort to be ready on time? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should John have a greater understanding of why she is late?</div>

Case	PART A		PART B
	Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Which of the following would be a better way to resolve the conflict?
	Check One		
	Hus-band	Wife	
			Check Only One
10. Conflict over car breakdown while taking a short week-end trip.			<div><div>—</div>Should Linda thoroughly carry out her responsibilities once she has accepted them? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Is Steve being unreasonable in blaming his wife for the work not getting done?</div>
11. Conflict over wife's conversations with her mother.			<div><div>—</div>Is Richard justified in becoming upset with Charlotte discussing matters with her mother? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Charlotte be able to speak freely with her mother?</div>
12. Conflict about the responsibility for throwing the garbage away.			<div><div>—</div>Is Larry neglecting his responsibility by not carrying out the garbage? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Is Judy expecting too much by asking her husband to carry out the garbage?</div>
13. Conflict over wife's conversations with men at parties.			<div><div>—</div>Should Nancy realize that her behavior can be interpreted by other men as flirtatious and could unintentionally lead to further involvements OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Bob trust his wife and not be upset that she is enjoying the company of other men?</div>
14. Conflict regarding evening entertainment.			<div><div>—</div>After working hard all day should Jerry be allowed to spend a quiet evening at home with his wife? OR</div> <div><div>—</div>Should Jerry understand and respond to Betty's boredom by going out in the evening?</div>

Case	PART A		PART B
	Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Which of the following would be a better way to resolve the conflict?
	Check One		
	Husband	Wife	Check Only One
15. Conflict over husband spending time at the office.			<input type="checkbox"/> Should Dick continue to devote the time that he knows is necessary to obtain advancement in his career? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Dick spend more time with his wife?
16. Conflict over wife's smoking.			<input type="checkbox"/> Should Tom feel he has the right to concern himself with his wife's health? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Tom leave Betty alone and quit pressuring her?
17. Conflict over TV football games.			<input type="checkbox"/> Should Chuck be able to watch football on Sunday afternoons? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should Chuck spend more time on Sundays with his wife?
18. Conflict of vacation vs. stereo speakers.			<input type="checkbox"/> Is it John's prerogative to decide how the family money will be spent? OR <input type="checkbox"/> Should financial expenditures be a joint decision?

(IMC JOINT JUDGMENT ANSWER SHEET)

Instructions:

Please read each case description and answer questions a, b, c and d for each case. Check the appropriate box in each column and do not leave any questions unanswered.

Item No.	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)
	Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Have you had a similar problem?		Have you known other couples who have similar problems?		
	Check One	Check One	Check One	Check One	Check One	Check One	
	Hus- band	Wife	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1							Should Bob ask Frank to phone before visiting? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
2							Is Cora being reasonable in refusing to discuss their sexual problems? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
3							Should Don be able to relax this way before dinner? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
4							Is it reasonable for Peter to question the necessity of Nina's purchase? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
5							Is Elaine justified in accusing Mark of being an inadequate provider? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
6							Should Jack be permitted to talk to another woman at a party without Collen becoming upset? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
7							Is Phil justified in worrying about starting counseling without being able to afford it? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
8							Should Susan be reading a magazine when her household duties are not completed and dinner is not prepared? <u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

		(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)
		Who is primarily responsible for the problem?		Have you had a similar problem?		Have you known other couples who have similar problems?		
		Check One		Check One		Check One		
Item No.	Hus-band	Wife	Yes	No	Yes	No		
9							Should Mary make a greater effort to be ready on time?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
10							Should Linda thoroughly carry out her responsibilities once she has accepted them?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
11							Is Richard justified in becoming upset with Charlotte discussing matters with her mother?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
12							Is Larry neglecting his responsibilities by not carrying out the garbage?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
13							Should Nancy realize that her behavior can be interpreted by other men as flirtatious and could unintentionally lead to further involvements?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
14							After working hard all day should Jerry be allowed to spend a quiet evening at home with his wife?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
15							Should Dick continue to devote the time that he knows is necessary to obtain advancement in his career?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>
16							Should Tom feel he has the right to concern himself with his wife's health?	<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u>

APPENDIX F

TABLE 1-A

Ranked Means of Locke-Wallace Ratings for All
R-S dyads

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	SS	82.5	SS vs. SR	.05
2	SN	97.8		
3	SR	104.7		
4	NS	107.9		
5	NR	113.8		
6	NN	114.1		
7	RS	115.1		
8	RN	115.1		
9	RR	120.2		

TABLE 2-A

Ranked Means of MACE Stress/Satisfaction Ratio for
Mate in Marital Dyads

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	RR	0.225	NR vs. NS	.05
2	NR	0.297		
3	RN	0.302		
4	RS	0.354		
5	NN	0.370		
6	SR	0.491		
7	SS	0.598		
8	NS	0.674		
9	SN	0.721		

TABLE 3-A

Ranked Means of IMC "Win" Index
for All R-S Dyads

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	RS	36.79	<u>RS</u> vs. <u>SR</u>	.05
2	RN	48.23		
3	SN	48.40		
4	SS	50.00		
5	RR	50.00		
6	NN	50.00		
7	NS	51.60		
8	NR	51.77		
9	SR	63.21		

TABLE 4-A

Ranked Means of Bales' "Difference Score"
for All R-S Dyads

Rank	Label	Mean
1	RN	-0.70
2	NS	-0.50
3	RR	0.05
4	RS	0.70
5	SS	1.10
6	NR	1.60
7	NN	1.85
8	SN	3.50
9	SR	3.50

TABLE 5-A

Ranked Means of MACE "Agreement Score" for
 "Generally satisfactory" Items for
 Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	S	0.703	S vs. R	.05
2	N	0.752		
3	R	0.775		

TABLE 6-A

Ranked Means of MACE "Agreement Score" for
 "Generally stressful" Items for
 Repressors, Neutrals, and Sensitizers

Rank	Label	Mean	Test	P
1	R	0.485	S vs. R	n.s.
2	S	0.519		
3	N	0.520		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altrocchi, J. Interpersonal perceptions of repressors and sensitizers and component analysis of assumed dissimilarity scores. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1961, 62, 528-534.
- Altrocchi, J., Parsons, O. A., and Dickoff, Hilda. Changes in self-ideal discrepancy in repressors and sensitizers. J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 67-72.
- Altrocchi, J., Shrauger, S., and McLeod, Mary. Attribution of hostility to self and others by expressors, sensitizers, and repressors. J. Clin. Psychol., 1964, 20, 233.
- Bales, R. F. Interaction process analysis: A method for the study of small groups, Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1950.
- Bruner, J. S., and Postman, L. Emotional selectivity in perception and reaction. J. Pers., 1947, 16, 69-77.
- Byrne, D. The repression-sensitization scale: Rationale, reliability, and validity. J. Pers., 1961, 29, 334-349.
- Byrne, D. Repression-sensitization as a dimension of personality. In B. Maher (Ed.), Progress in experimental personality research. Vol. I. New York: Academic Press, 1964. Pp. 169-220.
- Byrne, D. and Griffitt, W. Similarity and awareness of similarity of personality characteristics as determinants of attraction. J. Exp. Res. Pers., 1969, 3, 179-186.
- Byrne, D. and Sheffield, J. Response to sexually arousing stimuli as a function of repressing and sensitizing defenses. J. Abnorm. Psychol., 1965, 70, 114-118.
- Byrne, D., Barry, J., and Nelson, D. Relation of the revised repression-sensitization scale to measures of self-description. Psychol. Rep., 1963, 13, 323-334.

- Byrne, D., Blaylock, Barara, and Goldberg, June. Dogmatism and defense mechanisms. Psychol. Rep., 1966, 18, 739-742.
- Byrne, D., Golightly, Carole, and Sheffield, J. The repression-sensitization scale as a measure of adjustment: Relationship with the CPI. J. Consult. Psychol., 1965, 29, No. 6, 586-589.
- Byrne, D., Steinberg, M. A., and Schwartz, M. S. Relationship between repression-sensitization and physical illness. J. Abnorm. Psychol., 1968, 73, No. 2, 154-155.
- Carrera, R. N. and Cohen, A. M. Discussion patterns of homogeneous groups of repressors and sensitizers following success and failure. Psychol. Rep., 1968, 22, 7-14.
- Clarke, C. T. Marriage and college environment inventory. Personal communication. August, 1969.
- Cohen, A. M. and Carrera, R. N. Changes in the judgments of sensitizers and repressors in response to failure and success evaluations of group performance. J. Soc. Psychol., 1967, 72, 217-221.
- Cohen, A. M. and Foerst, J. R. Organizational behavior and adaptations to organizational change of sensitizer and repressor problem-solving groups. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., 1968, 8, 209-216.
- Gayton, W. and Bernstein, S. Incompatible need strength and the repression-sensitization dimension. J. Clin. Psychol., 1969, 15, No. 2, 192-194.
- Gordon, J. E. Interpersonal predictions of repressors and sensitizers. J. Pers., 1957, 25, 686-698.
- Joy, V. L. Repression-sensitization, personality, and interpersonal behavior. Doctoral dissertation, Univer. of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1963.
- Lacey, J. I. Psychophysiological approaches to the evaluation of psychotherapeutic process and outcome. In E. A. Rubinstein and M. B. Parloff (Eds.), Research in psychotherapy. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1959.
- Locke, H. I. and Wallace, K. M. Short marital adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marr. and Fam. Living, 1959, 21, 251-255.

- McReynolds, P. Anxiety as related to incongruencies between values and feelings. Psychol. Rec., 1958, 8, 57-66.
- Olson, D. H. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, D. C., October, 1969.
- Parsons, O. A., and Fulgenzi, L. B. Overt and covert hostility in repressors and sensitizers. Percept. Mot. Skills, 1968, 27, 537-538.
- Parsons, O. A., Fulgenzi, L. B., and Edelberg, R. Aggressiveness and psychophysiological responsivity in groups of repressors and sensitizers. J. Pers. Soc. Psychol., 1969, 12, 235-244.
- Raven, J. C. Controlled projection for children. London: H. K. Lewis and Co., Ltd., 1951.
- Strodtbeck, F. L. Husband-wife interaction over revealed difference. Amer. Soc. Rev., 1951, 16, 468-473.
- Thelen, M. H. Repression-sensitization: Its relation to adjustment and seeking psychotherapy among college students. J. Consult. Clin. Psychol., 1969, 33, No. 2, 161-165.
- Turk, H. Norms, persons, and sentiments. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 163-177.
- Wilkins, G. and Epting, F. Relationship between the R-S personality dimension and interpersonal cognitive complexity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Miami, Florida, March, 1971.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Dennis Alvin Day was born June 2, 1944, at West Palm Beach, Florida. In June, 1962, he graduated from Pompano Beach Senior High School, Pompano Beach, Florida. He enrolled in the University of Florida as a Robert O. Law Foundation Scholar and was awarded a Bachelor of Arts with departmental honors in psychology in 1966. He then enrolled in the Graduate School of the University of Florida in the Fall of 1966 as an NDEA Fellow to work toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. He completed his year's internship in clinical psychology at the Henderson Clinic of Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in September, 1971.

In 1967, Dennis Alvin Day married the former Priscilla Elaine Ogle of St. Petersburg, Florida. They are currently residing in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. He is a member of the Broward County Psychological Association and Psi Chi.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Benjamin Barger
Benjamin Barger, Chairman
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Carl T. Clarke
Carl T. Clarke
Professor of Psychology


I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Marvin E. Shaw
Marvin E. Shaw
Professor of Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Richard K. McGee
Richard K. McGee
Associate Professor of Clinical
Psychology and Psychology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.



Gerald R. Leslie
Professor of Sociology

This dissertation was submitted to the Department of Psychology in the College of Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate Council, and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April, 1972

Dean, Graduate School

35

ds 44 w/ L. Sec. Pub. (139)
SM27 17. 1.17. 194